
PROCEEDINGS

1988 Winter Seminar
Wednesday, January 27, 1988



REGIONAL -ISSUES-

— Where Do WE Fit In ? —



Edmonton Metropolitan
Regional Planning Commission

89-00760/

Table of Contents

Welcoming Addresses _____		Page 3
	—Mr. R.G. Madziya, Executive Director, E.M.R.P.C. —Mayor Ross G. Quinn, Chairman, E.M.R.P.C. —Mr. Archie R. Grover, Chairman, Alberta Planning Board	
Plenary Session _____		7
<i>Introduction</i>	—Mr. R. Norman Giffen, former Executive Director, E.M.R.P.C.	
<i>Guest Speaker</i>	—Professor L.O. Gertler, Director, School of Urban & Regional Planning, University of Waterloo	
Regional Airport Authorities _____		13
<i>Moderator</i>	—Councillor Albert Klapstein, County of Leduc	
<i>Speakers</i>	—Mr. Austin Douglas, Executive Director, Airport Management Study Group, Ottawa —Mr. Peter Watson, Chairman, Edmonton Regional Airport Authorities Task Force —Ms. Carrie Schnelker, Assistant General Counsel, Seattle, Washington	
Preserving Natural Areas for Fun & Profit _____		29
<i>Moderator</i>	—Mayor Lee Danchuk, Bon Accord	
<i>Speakers</i>	—Mr. Gerald McKeating, Program Head Canadian Wildlife Service, Edmonton —Mr. Bill Elliott, Executive Director, Fort Whyte Centre for Environmental Education, Manitoba —Mr. Michael O'Brien, Member, Gaetz Lake Sanctuary Committee, Red Deer —Mr. Robin Bovey, environmental writer, Edmonton	
Solid Waste Management _____		45
<i>Moderator</i>	—Alderman David Hinch, Spruce Grove	
<i>Speakers</i>	—Mr. Joe Kostler, Branch Head, Alberta Environment, Edmonton —Mr. Gilbert Boddez, Municipal Administrator, M.D. of Sturgeon —Mr. Len Hayten, Greater Vancouver Regional District	
Plenary Session—Workshop Reports _____		57
<i>Moderator</i>	—Mayor Ross G. Quinn, Chairman, E.M.R.P.C.	
<i>Speakers</i>	—Alderman David Hinch, Spruce Grove —Mayor Lee Danchuk, Bon Accord —Councillor Ron Pollock, County of Parkland	
Closing Remarks _____		63
	—Mr. R.G. Madziya, Executive Director, E.M.R.P.C. —Mayor Ross G. Quinn, Chairman, E.M.R.P.C.	

Welcoming Addresses



INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Mr. R.G. Madziya, Executive Director
Edmonton Metropolitan Regional Planning Commission

It is good to see so many familiar faces. I see a lot of faces that we saw last year and quite a few people who, perhaps, missed our first seminar last year. It is good to have you here for the first time and we appreciate those who are coming for the second time.

About 15 months ago, when a few of us started toying with and tossing around some ideas as to whether or not we should have a seminar, we thought we would try it as an experiment, and see how well we could do and how well it would be received. Through the feedback that we got, from a questionnaire that you were kind enough to fill out, we decided we would do it again, although most of the questions that the chairman and members of the Commission heard were, "How are you going to be able to top it, since you did so well last year?" Well, we believe that the programme for today is an indication of how hard and well staff, the Executive Committee and the Commission as a whole have worked. However, we will let you be the judge and we will, again, ask you to assist us in planning for next year by filling out the questionnaire that we have included with your registration material.

At this point I would like to ask His Worship the Mayor of Morinville, the Chairman of our Commission, to provide you with some welcoming remarks. Ross Quinn.

WELCOMING ADDRESS

Mayor Ross G. Quinn, Chairman
Edmonton Metropolitan Regional Planning Commission

Thank you RG.

Mr. Grover, Mayors, Reeves, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Edmonton Metropolitan Regional Planning Commission, it is a great pleasure to welcome you all to our second annual winter seminar. Last year's seminar was a great success, and I've heard many positive comments about it over the past year. But it's a little bit like throwing a party. Everyone wants you to do it again, so here we are. I also received a few negative comments about last year's seminar. Someone complained that every time you asked a question, the response always took the form of a question. So I said, why do you think that was? He wasn't amused.

On the positive side, however, we have taken a good look at the comments received on last year's survey, and, as a direct result of that feedback, we have made some fairly significant changes to the content and format of this year's seminar. Last year, for example, it was recognized that many of you were relatively new to both the Commission and Municipal Council, so the seminar concentrated on providing a more generalized overview of planning, and regional planning in particular. In addition, the EMRPC staff's participation in the various sessions was quite substantial. This year's seminar relies less on our professional staff and shifts the burden more towards a number of outside experts and our own Commission members. You will note also that the issues addressed in this year's seminar are not generalized issues, as was the case last year, but are very specific, and are of great current interest within the Edmonton Metropolitan region. To say that they may be controversial would be an understatement!

You may ask yourselves why the Regional Planning Commission is concerned about these issues when the Regional Plan, itself, hasn't really been involved with them. My answer is that just because the Commission hasn't dealt directly with these issues in the past does not mean that the issues are not regional in nature or that they aren't important. They most definitely are regional issues and they most definitely are important to every municipality in this region.

Maybe these are the kinds of issues that the EMRPC should be involved in, or maybe not, but let's talk about them. Let's face facts. We live in a region where the actions of one municipality can have important effects on other municipalities; a region where some issues require the involvement of more than one municipality in order to find an optimal solution to a problem. We also live in a time of high technology, a time when changes are coming at us thick and fast, and a time of continued budgetary restraint. We can no longer afford to think and act independently, without so much as a thought for the other guy. We have to be co-operative, to act in a co-ordinated manner, to support each other in the search for solutions to common problems. We haven't got the funds to go charging blindly ahead on our own independent paths, and pay to clean up for our mistakes. We need to plan carefully for the future. We need to sit down and talk to each other.

To illustrate this, in 1935, President Roosevelt in the USA wanted to know what the nation would look like fifteen years down the road and, if possible, determine what would be expected of the government and the people of the USA, and North America in general, in the next fifteen years, or by the year 1950. He put together a team of experts that covered virtually every facet of life at that particular time. Agriculture, education, law, politics, science, international politics were studied and reported

on. We know that some of the areas that weren't discussed were jets, radar, TV, rockets, space travel, nuclear power, computers, and high technology, to name a few, but we certainly know now the effects that these things had on that period of time and have had on us ever since.

We are now in a period of high tech rapid change. The next fifteen years will produce major changes in all our environments and we should be as well prepared as possible to deal with them.

The Commission's purpose in putting together today's seminar is to provide a forum where all municipalities, within the metropolitan region, can sit down together and discuss issues which are current and, perhaps, controversial. There is no point in shying away from these issues, just because they may be controversial. In my opinion, it is better to tackle them squarely and with the best information we can find and as much inter-municipal consultation as we can get. In this way we can be more aware of the facts of the issues, and can get a better idea of how our individual decisions can affect the other municipalities in our region, and vice versa. As somebody once said, and this applies particularly to the Edmonton Metropolitan Region, we are a community of communities. We are all in this together, whether we represent Devon, Bon Accord, Leduc, City of Edmonton, MD of Sturgeon, whatever. So let's work together. Let's share information. Let's co-operate. Let's co-ordinate. Let's communicate with each other. Let's use this seminar as a means of exploring the issues at hand, and let's build on the use of the Regional Planning Commission as a forum for discussion in solving these and other issues which affect more than one municipality.

Finally, let me urge you all to approach today's seminar with an open mind. There are no binding decisions to be made today. As decision-makers, we can breathe a sigh of relief, and go to the sessions to learn, to discuss, to explore the possibilities, ask questions, be inquisitive, relax, participate, and, most of all, have a good time. With that, ladies and gentlemen, I would now like to call up Mr. Archie Grover for a few comments from the Alberta Planning Board.

**Mr. Archie R. Grover, Chairman
Alberta Planning Board**

Thank you Mr. Quinn. Mayors, Reeves, ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed a pleasure for me to be here to bring you greetings from the Alberta Planning Board and from Alberta Municipal Affairs. I'd like to thank the Edmonton Metropolitan Regional Planning Commission for inviting me here to bring greetings from the Board and the Department. I've looked through the agenda and I note that it's a very full day. I hope that everyone will participate in

the discussions. I would like to compliment the member municipalities, and the staff of the Edmonton Metropolitan Regional Planning Commission for dealing with the many complex issues that they face in the Edmonton area today. In fact, I see many directors and chairmen of other regional planning commissions, and I know that all of you are dedicated to making your region an even better place in which to live and work.

Now, I'm sure that many of you who are not new to planning can remember that, in the world of planning, and in fact in any type of occupation that one gets involved in, there's a lingo that goes along with the occupation. There are lots of new words, phrases and jargon that have to be deciphered before one can even talk planning to anyone, or, even more importantly, be able to understand what many planners are saying. Even our newly appointed minister had to face this challenge of becoming more familiar with the language of planning. In fact, just a couple of weeks ago, he phoned up Jack Thomas and asked for some information about a certain planning issue. Jack told him that it was very straightforward and thoughtfully explained that the DP was referred to the DO for a decision by the MPC which had to ensure that it conformed with the GMP, ASP and LUB. Then it was appealed to the DAB, but before all this could happen, the SAA, being the RPC, had to approve the subdivision which was appealed to the APB. I don't know why, but the minister is still asking questions with respect to this statement.

More seriously, many of you may ask, what does Municipal Affairs have to do with regional planning and how does the Department fit into the regional scene? I believe that we do this in a number of ways. We support municipalities with various programs and assistance in a wide range of planning matters. Examples of this are support for the "Revitalizing Downtown Alberta" kit, and the orientation programme for development appeal boards. We also administer and review the Planning Act and any amendments thereto. We provide policy direction and guidance for many regional issues.

As many of you are aware, Alberta Municipal Affairs celebrated its 75th anniversary as a department last year. The theme that we had was, "serving since 1912". I hope that 1988 will be the start of the next 75 years of co-operative working relationships with municipalities and regional planning commissions throughout this province. On behalf of the Alberta Planning Board, and the Department, I want to wish all of you a very successful seminar today. I look forward to talking to each of you, and thank you very much.

Plenary Session



PLENARY SESSION

Introduction by Mr. R. Norman Giffen
former Executive Director,
Edmonton Metropolitan Regional Planning Commission

Good Morning. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, it is my pleasure to introduce our guest speaker. Len Gertler goes a long way back in planning in Alberta. I think he might even admit that he cut his planning teeth while he was Director of the Edmonton District Planning Commission in the early 1950s. Regional planning in Alberta benefited by his contributions to the McNally Commission on Metropolitan Development in 1955. There is a strong suspicion that he authored the chapter on regional planning in their final report. This chapter formed the basis of the major amendments to the Planning Act passed in 1957 and these amendments formed the foundation for regional planning as we know it today.

We, who worked with Len, have followed his career with great interest. I guess we have a proprietary interest because of a feeling that he is one of our boys who made it. Len Gertler has been, and is, a major force in Canadian planning, both academically and in general practice. His resume shows that his abilities and interests have covered a wide spectrum, both in Canada and internationally. Finally, on a purely personal note, I am grateful that Len saw fit to hire me and launch me on my own career in planning. Len ---

Guest Speaker

Professor L.O. Gertler, Director
School of Urban & Regional Planning,
University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario

Mr. Chairman, Norm, members and staff of the Commission, distinguished guests and other old friends, I am indeed very pleased to be with you this morning. As you may know, it is over 30 years since I left the employ of the Commission and this is the first time I have been asked to come back. It is an offer that I could not refuse. Seriously, when Ron Mattiussi approached me on behalf of the Commission, last November I believe, I knew that the timing was not the best for me. I would be in Indonesia most of December and would be returning on January 1st with a pile of urgencies on my desk, a report on the Indonesian assignment to complete, and a planning school to rev up and move into high gear for the winter term, etc. etc. But nevertheless, I was determined to join you today.

I have returned to Edmonton only a few times since I left the Commission. I must say that my welcome, on the first occasion, was not as warm as it is today. The occasion was an annual conference of the Canadian Institute of Planners, held at the Chateau Lacombe. It was in 1970, 13 years after I had left the Commission, and I was placed on the thirteenth floor, and in room 1313. Was someone trying to tell me something?

My participation in the 1988 winter seminar is not simply a matter of loyalty to my old alma mater, although I do owe a lot to and am grateful to the Edmonton region. There are memories to be rekindled, and people, here, whom it is a pleasure to meet again. Even more compelling than these personal reasons, however, is an appreciation of how important Edmonton is in the evolution of the concept and practice of regional planning in this country. What I would like to do this morning is to reflect on my experience here, drawing on the impact of those six formative years when all hell broke loose in the oil patch and, by so doing, perhaps touch upon and suggest something of the significance of your efforts over the years and how you might connect up your heritage as a pioneer in regional planning with some of the challenges of the late 20th century.

When I left Edmonton, I was appointed to the staff of the City of Toronto Planning Board. While I was there I was given leave, for part of 1960 and '61, to join one of the crusades of one, John Diefenbaker. It was to serve as co-ordinator for regional development for the Resources for Tomorrow Conference, a national probe on Canada's renewable resources - agriculture, forestry, fisheries, water resources, wildlife, and recreational resources. Regional development was the framework for looking at all those things in the real world context of their association with economic processes, the growth of towns and cities, and the development and use of land.

When I faced the challenge of preparing the theme paper for the set of background papers for the conference, I found that my frame of reference was the Edmonton region - those vivid lessons I had learned during my meditations, as I travelled the backroads of this region on frigid February nights, perhaps with Norm or Frank or Dan, back and forth to meetings of the development committee in Fort Saskatchewan, Morinville or Stony Plain.

I have the temerity to indulge in this because, at that time, the time of that particular background paper, I had the sense that my statement earned some acknowledgement as a perspective which rang true and which people

from various other places in the country found useful. It contained insights that they could relate to. But, in addition, I hope that this recall will serve as a kind of benchmark statement on that period when the Edmonton region was responding creatively to the forces of extremely rapid urban growth - at least about 7% per year, or doubling every 14 years - a time when Edmonton fashioned a unique planning system. You went through the growing pains of building some sense of a regional community. You fought over issues of where urban development should properly go. You cared deeply about these things. The Commission almost exploded. You went through the trauma of the McNally Royal Commission. In the end, aided by some courageous political leadership and the wisdom of the Alberta Planning Board, you made the leap from a talk shop, and a fragmented one at that, to a serious regional institution, charged with the responsibility of shaping the broad strategic features of the country's fastest growing urban region. And under the new rules of plan adoption, now Sections 51 and 54 in the Planning Act, you also assumed the obligation to work towards a consensus that you would, as individual municipalities, undertake to fulfill.

With these, not so long ago regional images in mind, I propose to outline that benchmark concept, as I abstracted and generalized it for the Resources for Tomorrow Conference. And then, after doing that, I hope concisely, to move on to indicate some of the emerging forces at work, and what implications they might hold for regional planning, 1988.

The concept starts with the notion of a region having both urban and rural components and with a significant sense of identity, based on history, trade, shared values; a region that is engaged in a planning process that unfolds in four interrelated phases. These are: a strategy for growth, protection of land; the search for a development strategy; and, integration with broader levels of planning. With hindsight, it is important to see these dynamically. As cities and towns expand, there is a concern that they do not get out of control. Strategies to guide growth, plans, by-laws and regulations are applied. But these processes generate conflict that is focused on issues of land for space, for production, for recreation and enjoyment. The regional plan, by adjudicating the various trade-offs, say between factories and farms, becomes the vehicle for reconciling the claims of property and community.

These first two phases, however, are defensive, and that posture cannot be sustained indefinitely. What is needed is a more positive view of what the region can and should be. The planning process moves from an emphasis on overcoming the waste and misuse of resources to providing a guide for the optimum use and development of the region's resources and

locational advantages; and from a preoccupation with halting the degradation of the environment to creating the best possible setting for the community's life.

I would like to point out, that even in the benchmark model, we gave serious consideration to the link between economy and environment. I will, this time, quote. "Regional planning is the ecology of the human community. It involves the search for the combination of conditions essential for both optimum economic development and optimum environment. In this sense regional planning is much more than just that type of planning applied to an area bigger than a municipal unit. Its content, as well as its form are rooted in the region. The economic goal is approached by developing the possibilities inherent in the unique climate, resources, location, labor force, and technological and capital facilities of the region, and the environmental goal is approached by developing the possibilities inherent in the unique landscape, traditions and culture, as well as location and climate of the region."

To be sure the pathway to this proactive planning is not in a straight line and it is pockmarked with landmines. This is, in part, a strategy of intelligence, knowledge-based, knowing the genius of the region and, in part, it is a development strategy, multi-sectoral, mobilizing both public and private development resources towards regional goals.

The third phase, however, cannot be pursued in isolation from other regions, both in a positive sense of mutual dependence and in a negative sense of striking a balance between the claims of related regions. What might appear as the flowering of the good life from inside the region, may, from the outside, look like metropolitan aggression and exploitation. So optimizing the development of regions depends on a broader scale of policy concern and leadership, a sense of direction at the level of the province and even the nation. I will let those chips fall where they may!

Against this background of a benchmark model, let's look at some of the emerging influences. I will speak in general terms because I have to. I have been following your development process and your game plans only from a distance. But I feel that I may not be too far off base, because I know, in my gut, something about the soul of Edmonton. Someone has recently written, "Edmonton is a solid, bourgeois city." It may be, but it is much more than that. This is a thoroughly modern, go-to-it, pragmatic, show-me, open-to-the-world, progressive region with a solid rural base. The depth is not only in your topsoil. In spirit, you are very much part of the surge toward sophisticated technology, towards diversified service industry. I see the towers of Jasper Avenue. Call it high tech, high tension, the post-industrial or information society, and all

this is colored and shaped by your own civic personality which inherits some contradictory traditions. Pioneer society produced both a rugged individualism and a spirit of co-operation. Both were necessities for survival. At best, in your moments of glory like the Commonwealth Games, or enduring achievements like the valley open space system, these two traits are expressed in an integrated character which contains the dynamism and high spirits of the first, tempered by a sense of social responsibility and an uncommon capacity for effective action at the level of the community. Fear not, I will put away the psychiatrist's couch immediately! This is simply context for the identification of the forces, given where you are coming from, which you will be confronting in what will soon be the post-Reagan era.

First, it has to be appreciated that some of the forces underlying the benchmark model are alive and well, but they assume, in some instances, a new twist. Take urbanization, for example, which from the point of view of this audience is one of the most important of the broad, influencing factors. To be sure, your urban growth rate is lower than in the post-Leduc period. But notwithstanding that, the outward push of human settlement from the core city, or the pressure for it, is greater than ever. This is clearly demonstrated in both national and regional statistics on the growth of non-farm rural population and on the conversion and loss of farm land. A complex of factors underlies this phenomenon. To the mid-century technology of the automobile is added the late twentieth century technology of computer communications networks. This, in turn, is translated into a proliferation of lifestyles which allow some of us to break the tight locational connection between home and work and the regular daily rhythm of the journey between the two, and to locate our residences in the hamlet, town or outlying smaller city. We may work at home or in a decentralized workplace; linked via networks to the downtown head office. Please understand, I am not here making a case for a technological nirvana. I am observing that to all of the forces that have in the past contributed to the ex-urban urge, a new powerful set of technological economic forces has been added. This places an even greater importance upon sustaining a regional view in analysis, planning and policy-making to distinguish those economic activities that are oriented to major centres, and those which can flourish better in outlying locations.

A not inconsiderable factor in a place like Edmonton are the preferences of people. As the metropolis matures, employment is increasingly based on refined skills and professional capabilities, and, for people like that, the ability to select a preferred residential environment is one of the touchstones of well-being and personal freedom.

As one who was associated with the Noel Dant period of residential neighborhood design, I have to admit that however well it may have served a more complacent populous in the past, it is not the wave of the future for everybody. The standards of neighborhood design, in this region, are second to none and better than most, but consumer preferences are going in the direction of greater diversity of choice, in both the form and location of residential habitats.

Another aspect of technological change, with implications for regional planning, is the effect of information technology on the Canadian space economy. The new technology extends the range of opportunities to connect or disconnect, to centralize or decentralize, to concentrate or distribute decision-making. Recent corporate studies suggest that where the pre-existing decision structures have been biased towards head office control, the new capacities will be used to further concentrate power. I do not for a moment suggest that we must be resigned to that verdict. That is the scenario of inertia. Replacing it with a more developmental, regionally balanced view of Canada, however, would seem to call for more vigorous pursuit of phases three and four of the benchmark model. In the expansionary days of the '50s, '60s and '70s, these aspects were submerged by the struggle to keep up with the demands of growth and by the aura of affluence and limitless opportunity. In the next period, when the race will go to the alert and the swift, carefully formulated positive development strategies, conscientiously pursued, deserve a place at the top of the regional planning agenda.

The final change factor, on which I wish to comment, is really a complex of forces. I will call it the new environmental consciousness. It is new in the sense of being distinguished from the simplistic view of the earlier period which focused on a series of single, sometimes crisis, events - an oil spill, Strontium 90 from nuclear testing, and so on. That environmental movement has been very important in the evolution of public opinion and of political will. But it is now being superseded by a more complex and demanding view which leads directly to the doorstep of organizations like the Edmonton Metropolitan Regional Planning Commission.

There are two major manifestations of the new consciousness. First, the shift from single project environmental impact assessment (EIA), to cumulative effects assessment (CEA), and, secondly, the concept of sustainable development. CEA, cumulative effects assessment refers to such things as the net environmental effect of an activity or activities through a series of perturbations; for example, the increasing size and number of salt dumps on the prairies arising from petroleum processing which create the hazard of airborne pollution in the

event of strong winds. It is recognized that effective cumulative impact assessment is as much an institutional, as a scientific challenge. This arises out of the mismatch between the impacts which are integrated, and the institutional responsibility which is, usually, fragmented. To overcome this gap, a recent bi-national Canada - US meeting anticipated a widespread public and political demand for adaptive regional planning, with broad public and industry participation.

co-operative action, that you move from "thou shalt not" to "we will."

Sustainable development, the other aspect of this new consciousness, hit the headlines in 1987 through the publication of Our Common Future, the dramatic report of the World Commission on Environment and Development, known as the Brundtland Commission. It is an eclectic concept, which owes a debt to such ideas as permanent agriculture, conservation, recycling and ecology. The core of the proposal is to integrate economic and environmental decision-making - one decision-making model. Feasibility studies should never again be exclusively economic studies of cost/benefit. It calls for development institutions that will allow for the consideration of inter-sectoral factors (say, the relationship between environment and business development or public works), and for the initiation of such processes as regional spatial planning to ensure an appropriate fit between land capability and land use. It also calls for much else. The context of the proposals is a justifiable alarm that the cumulative effects of environmental abuse or neglect are causing a steady degradation of our life support systems.

It seems clear that the EMRPC has some of the credentials for the role of agent for sustainable development - in the scale of the region, in your mandate, and most important, in your members. You have, at least, the major municipal public sector actors, who, together, are responsible for shaping the fate of the Edmonton region. You may have noted that this is an issue which has attained a conspicuous public profile. It has been endorsed by the Federal Environment Minister, and a high-powered national Task Force on Environment and Economy with substantial private sector involvement has, this past fall, called for "a radical revamping of Canada's planning and decision-making processes to meet its obligations of managing carefully and protecting the resources held in trust for future Canadians".

"A radical revamping of Canada's planning and decision making processes" - I see little need for radical revamping here. If I read your Planning Act correctly, only one thing seems to be missing, and that is the ability on the basis of a Commission consensus, to take positive action on a decidedly regional matter, like the kinds of issues related to waste management, parks and recreation and regional airports that are on your programme today. Maybe it is time, drawing on your abundant capacity for



**Regional Airport
Authorities:**

REGIONAL AIRPORT AUTHORITIES

Moderator: Councillor Albert Klapstein
County of Leduc, Alberta

The Edmonton Regional Airport Authorities Task Force has been busy working with Transport Canada in negotiating the what, when and how of regional airport deregulation. This issue affects the entire commission membership, as discussion involves the future management of the Edmonton International, Edmonton Municipal, Cooking Lake and Villeneuve airport facilities. This seminar is an opportunity to address these questions, to report on the current status of negotiations, and to examine the Seattle airport as a case study in how the Port of Seattle Commission operates. The order of presentation will be Mr. Austin Douglas, Mr. Peter Watson and Ms. Carrie Schnelker.

I'll give you a brief biography of Mr. Austin. Mr. Austin is the Executive Director of the Airport Management Study Group for Transport Canada. A professional engineer, Austin Douglas obtained a Bachelor's Degree in Civil Engineering in 1948 at Manchester University and a Master's Degree in Transportation in 1960 at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He joined Transport Canada in 1953 after spending four years in Australia in the design and construction of airports. He spent nine years in the Central Region, in airport development work, and transferred to Ottawa headquarters in 1962. He has worked through progressively responsible positions and is currently the Executive Director of the Airport Management Studies Working Group on the implementation of the new airport policy. His experience also includes five years in Treasury Board, responsible for transportation programs, and three years with the World Bank in Washington in the appraisal of aviation projects in many different countries. He obtained his commercial pilots license in 1956. Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Austin Douglas.

Mr. Austin Douglas, Executive Director
Airport Management Study Group, Transport Canada,
Ottawa, Ontario

Thank you Mr. Chairman. Ladies and gentlemen, it is my pleasure to be in Alberta again, once more. I seem to be spending some time, in the recent past, in the Calgary area and Edmonton area, so it's a case of balancing one with the other. In order to see how we're balancing our interests in these various panels this morning. I looked at the one next door, and saw they have a subtitle, called "For Fun and Profit". We

like to think there is a certain element of fun and profit in airports. So we look forward to the new challenges of institutional changes and more economic development fitting in with the local environment.

To help us focus on what is the current consideration, across the country and particularly here in Edmonton, I thought I would trace back some of the things which have been leading to these current initiatives over the last couple of years. I have structured my thoughts and speaking points into six areas, which I'll list for you.

1. Looking at what's been going on in the world of air transportation, what the changing needs of the industry are.
2. How the legislative and institutional response has been faring in dealing with those changes.
3. Dealing with the formation of the Airports' Authority Group within Transport Canada in this country.
4. The development and promulgation of the new Airports' Policy by the Minister last year in Vancouver.
5. What the options for more local and regional involvement in airports are in Canada.
6. A digest of what's been going on across the country in other areas that you might be interested in, in response to the promulgation of the new Airports' policy.

Changes within the industry - What has been happening? We, of course, are contiguous with the major aviation air transportation industry of the United States, and deregulation of that industry over the last seven or eight years has gradually reached the stage where it was beginning to affect what was going on in Canada. So, yes, we look at the mergers that have taken place in the carrier industry. We look at the way in which the ground infrastructure has been challenged to respond to those changes. We look at more frequent services, different levels of service, and what the public is beginning to be concerned about - safety - so we had to be concerned.

How did the Canadian environment respond, come to grips with, and live with those pressures which were going on in the United States? Indeed, the air carrier industry did respond.

We've seen mergers take place, we've seen hubbing and spoking actions being focused on, different levels of service, more frequent services to smaller centres, the introduction of different types of aircraft, and different ways of packaging services in this country. So the need to develop relationships between the institutions that provide and regulate those services, with the actual users and the travelling public itself, meant they have had to be refocused and redesigned.

We should also try to remember what was going on in this country in 1985. If you cast your mind back, in the area of the economy of the country, you will remember that there was a big discussion about the rising federal deficit, and what to do about it. The budget of May 23, 1985 focused on those things and there was a passing reference, in the budget papers of that year, to the need to look at a more effective way in which airports should be managed in Canada. How they could be organized, and how they could be made to be more self-sufficient, and responsive to the needs of local groups. Also, it was recognized that if the government was to set a good example in controlling its deficits then it should be seen to be very concerned about its own spending program. The need to curtail and control expenses was very much in the public eye at that time.

Some of the other things that were going on in the summer of '85 relate to the Task Force on Programme Management, commonly known as the Nielsen report. The report recommended that "the government consider making a fundamental change in airport policy from ownership and centralized public service operation to one of non-federal ownership and operation."

We also had the issuance of the White Paper called Freedom to Move. In that they were stressing less regulation, a greater reliance on competition and the market forces dealing with all forms of transport, and the need to consider government support for services in the public interest which may not necessarily be commercially viable. And I'll quote from the Freedom to Move Paper, "The Department would make every effort, consistent with safety and security, to reduce the administrative burdens of its operations on carriers, and to ensure that existing facilities are being efficiently used before new capital would be spent; that operational activities would be conducted in a more commercial manner that would encourage freer competition among carriers".

So there were several things going on, leading to the recognition and the opportunity for institutional adjustment and reform; a recognition at the political level that the time had come to be recognizing the pressures for more local involvement in decision-making where the spending of money and the raising of budgets were being focused on. These things led to the design of the new National Transportation Act

which was recently promulgated, and which, of course, stresses highest practicable safety standards, provides for competition and economic regulation, shows that carriers and the different modes of transport should bear their fair share of the costs, and that the various carriers and modes should receive fair compensation for the services that they will provide.

The responses to all these challenges required Transport Canada to react in different ways, in developing new policies, adjusting its operations and procedures, and changing its form of institution, its infrastructures and the facilities it would provide. In talking about the reorganization of Transport Canada, we should recognize the pressures to have a form of institution that would respond to the modal changes taking place - air, marine and surface - and the need to co-ordinate the policies that would be prevalent in the administration of the new Act; to co-ordinate them at what we call the corporate level, in Headquarters and in the Regions. To do that, a new position, the Regional Director of Co-ordination, was formed in each region. The person in this Western Region is Phil Bowes, whom I am sure many of you in this room will know.

There was a new emphasis on security and emergency planning, because of the need to reinforce the role of the Federal government in ensuring safety. And of course, getting down to airports, there was the creation of the Airports Authority group on October 15 of that year. The objectives were to operate airports in a more efficient, safe and secure manner, maximizing revenue generating opportunities, and enhancing local involvement. There were other changes on the marine and surface side which I don't think I need go into at this time, but which are available in the literature dealing with the changes that led to the Act.

In looking at the implementation of the new Airports' policy in 1987, the thrust of that policy is to recognize the government's approval of a two-part policy; one part dealing with the devolution of airports, transferring them to other forms of ownership; and the second part dealing with improving the management and operation of those airports that we do retain, to make them more self-sufficient, more commercially oriented, more responsive to local involvement.

What's in the name, Airport Authority? Well, there's a lot in a name. It's a form of communication. It identifies who you are, what it is that you want to be doing, and what type of image you want to create. But there are various forms of airport authority, and when the Minister's Task Force, which was appointed by Mr. Mazankowski in 1985, was charged with the responsibility of looking at various options for the management framework of airports, they did look at a variety of authorities, typified by the types of things going on in different

municipalities in the United States. They looked at other countries' systems of airport authorities, particularly in Europe, but also in Australia, New Zealand and so on. And it was recognized that there were very many different forms of local authority, depending on the way they were set up legally, institutionally; the way they were held accountable to the public; the way in which they involved the private sector; the way they involved their financing and their borrowing powers, and so on. So it was brought home, pretty clearly, that there was no really one ideal type of model on airport authority that you could import and say this is what we should be doing. All were taken into account. They made recommendations that the best features, involving autonomy, local involvement, methods of financing, would have to be designed on a case by case basis, for application in the Canadian environment. I suppose the generic definition of the words "local airport authority" would include, for example, that it would have to be a properly mandated local entity set up to own, operate and finance the local airport or airports.

Our new policy on the future management framework for airports applies to all 138 airports which the Airports Authority Group owns, and it stresses that the government will be receptive to receiving proposals to apply Part 1 of the policy for takeover. It recognizes that such a takeover could be implemented either by a straight-out sale or lease, and that those airports which we would retain, at least for the time being in preparation for that event, that those airports within Transport Canada would have an increased emphasis on commercial viability, on private sector involvement and in a form of management which was more responsive to local interests and concerns.

Why would the government move in the direction of adopting as a solution, local airport authorities? Well, it was based on the government's recognition that there was a wish, in many local environments, to see local groups play a major role in the actual operations of an airport, decision-making on investments, setting the levels of service which they felt they had a right to enjoy with the industry, and to be more responsive in actually meeting those local conditions. There was also the recognition, within the ideology of the present government, that there should be more involvement by the private sector. An example that has been going on and which you may well be familiar with is, for instance, the development of the new Terminal Three in Toronto. The private sector has been fully mobilized, through the lease of a piece of that airport to them, to enable them to plan, design, construct, finance and operate a new major third terminal which is roughly a \$350 million investment. The government was also concerned about the pressures from local municipalities to recognize the need for integrated development opportunities, job

creation and the further development of the municipal tax base.

So, in looking at the options for local and regional involvement, how does one get involved? I think, Mr. Chairman, that that was one of the questions that you felt this panel could look at. How should we become involved in doing these things?

- . The first part of the policy calls for proposals from interested groups, who are willing to get a local mandate from their principals, to see how they can negotiate the takeover of one or more airports. A proper mandate would have to be one recognized by the municipalities served by the airport and also by the province.
- . By becoming more locally involved in such a way that it would provide new opportunities for integration with regional economic development planning, (and our main speaker this morning has touched on the need for a broader approach to regional economic development planning); opportunities for participating in establishing priorities for retail and commercial development on and adjacent to airports; in fact to become a master of one's own destiny at the local level by accepting responsibility and accountability for various airport management functions, including operations and maintenance.
- . By developing a self-sufficient entity, one in which you would be confident that you would know how it would be operated and financed. You wouldn't be dancing to somebody else's tune.
- . And particularly, how can more private sector involvement be developed?

On the second part of the new policy, that which will govern the types of airports that we retain, at least for the time being whilst they were being prepared for a more commercial approach, we'd developed what we call the Transport Canada Airports' Authority Model. It provides for a number of initiatives, even now. It does provide for more local involvement, as far as we can within our current form of departmental institution, by emphasizing and enhancing the consultative process with local groups, elected groups and user groups; an increased emphasis on community relations, so there is good communication; and, the creation of economic development boards, which would consist of ministerially appointed local businessmen who can provide the experience in business knowledge and acumen needed for advising the airport manager on the implementation and development of a business plan for the airport.

We are seeking to attract more private sector involvement and we have a new mandate to be developing commercial activities on airports, as well as adjacent to airports. We would be looking for more freedoms from the central agencies but, of course, with freedom there must

be some measure of control, so we would have to devise a more commercially oriented system within the department. This would involve a more commercial approach to accounting, adopting accrual accounting standards instead of relying solely on the government's cash accounting system, the development of business plans in the commercial sense, and operating, as best we can, within the confines of the Financial Administration Act, but with the norms of commercial challenges to measure our performance. We have developed retail and commercial plans for 81 airports, as a means of focusing on what the opportunities are, to convince ourselves so that we can, in turn, go out and convince the local private sector that there are opportunities for development and further expansion.

Now, in the actual policy itself, which I referred to, there are certain principles which would apply to any devolution exercise dealing with airports. I won't go into them here, but if there are any questions, either later on this morning or this afternoon, I could go on and explain those. But, essentially, in the principles for devolution, we are talking about safety and security being a responsibility of the federal government; we are talking about the provision for financial arrangements; we are talking about employee benefits, continuity. Things like that would have to be focused on and negotiated, to enable a successful devolution to occur. And in doing that, in applying those principles to a local situation, such as here in Edmonton, there are some emerging issues which we have focused on, and which I'm quite sure the proponents of the devolution of the local airports are also considering. How to set it up institutionally? What form of legislation would be required? What about the financial implications for such a transaction? How do you establish a valuation of the assets? What will be a fair compensation, either as a sale price or as a rental price? What physical facilities are to be split off, and which ones are to be retained? I am referring now to airports versus the air navigation or aeronautical facilities which would be retained by Transport Canada. What are the cost-sharing arrangements that we would have to agree to, up front or along the way in the short or medium term? What would constitute an equitable employee transfer package, because we're talking, in the Edmonton area, of upwards of 150 people whose long term careers are at stake? And how do you arrange for a credible communication plan, both with the public, the media, and with employees and the users to explain what's going on and how it's being managed?

What's been going on elsewhere? Well, by far the greatest impetus for interest is right here in the province of Alberta, with the two airports at Edmonton and at Calgary. And of those, Edmonton is quite advanced; in fact, Edmonton is the most advanced of any initiative for airport devolution of any site in the

country. Vancouver is very interested in it. There have been public statements made and a consultant's study, which deals with their interest in forming a local airport authority, is now under consideration. There is not a great deal of interest on the prairies, in Saskatchewan and Manitoba, nor in the Maritime region of Canada. There is a very strong interest in Montreal, with the future management and takeover of the two airports at Dorval and Mirabel, and a local group has come forward. They have become incorporated and mandated to deal with us in discussing how best they should go about doing that. In Ontario, the City of Ottawa and the surrounding area, the regional municipality, has been considering it and it is very much under study right now. We have another proposal from Thunder Bay, where the group had quite a discussion with the City and the emerging group to talk to us is the Thunder Bay Harbour Commission. It has come up with the idea that an integration of the port and the airport is quite feasible and we are currently having discussions with them about that. That's very interesting to us, because that form of legislation is somewhat different. It has some attractions, so we look forward to that type of discussion.

Across the country, there has been a lot of interest expressed in what does the policy mean, how do we explain it, is there an intermediate step, such as going through part 2, establishing an Economic Development Board to develop the ideas and advise the elected representatives what they should do? Should they stay with the part 2 of the policy, or should they really devolve and go into the implementation of part 1 of the policy? It's been a busy time, I think I've crossed the country six times in the past year, explaining to local groups what the policy is, how it can apply to them, and answering the questions. I welcome the chance to be here again, I will welcome questions at the appropriate time, and look forward to a further discussion this afternoon.

Moderator

Thank you very much, Mr. Douglas. Our next presenter is Mr. Peter Watson. He is Chairman of the Edmonton Regional Airport Authorities Task Force. Mr. Watson is currently the president of Roy Henry Insurance Ltd., one of the older and larger private insurance brokerage houses in Alberta. He joined the firm in 1976, and has been responsible for the development of the commercial business market. Prior to joining Roy Henry Insurance, Mr. Watson spent ten years with Air Canada in various positions in marketing and finance, leading to the position, Director of Corporate Planning and member of the Committee of Management. Mr. Watson is a graduate of the London School of Economics, with a Masters of Science in Economics, and the Royal Military College of Canada, with a B.A. in Commerce and Economics. He has also attended the Harvard Graduate School of Business and lectured at McGill University. Mr. Watson was appointed Chairman of the Regional Airport Task Force Association in May of 1987. He also served as a member of the Edmonton Air Services Authority for six years, and was chairman of the Airline Subcommittee of the Authority. Mr. Watson is also the Vice Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Misericordia Hospital. Welcome, Mr. Watson.

Mr. Peter Watson, Chairman
Edmonton Regional Airport Authorities Task Force,
Edmonton, Alberta

Thank you, Albert. Ladies and gentlemen, I can assure you, Albert, that I'll do my utmost to live up to the billing that you gave me, but trust that you people will understand when I, inevitably, fall short. I am delighted, and somewhat intimidated, to be speaking to a group of professional planners. I'm delighted because I was in the planning business for a number of years, as Albert said, in the finance area and in the marketing area, and in the corporate planning area, but believe me, that's simple stuff compared with regional planning and all the complexities that go into the things that you wrestle with.

The theme of your conference asks how regional should this be. Those of you in the audience, whom I have spoken to on this subject of the regional airports, will, I think, know my position. It should be as regional as it can possibly be. Who should be involved? I guess we'd like to get as many people involved and supportive of this initiative as we can. I've been asked specifically to deal with the social-political aspects of preparing the proposal, our proposal, for the mandating and funding of the Edmonton Regional Airports Authority, to try and bring you up-to-date on where we are on that application, what obstacles and problems we may have run into and what we anticipate. Well, you've hit my hot button and

if you have to shut me down in ten or fifteen minutes, Albert, I'll understand.

Austin has given you a very good background and I appreciate that lead-in to where I'll try and start my portion of today's discussions in the general background of this whole issue. And let there be no misunderstanding, this is a federal initiative, this devolution question. It's something that maybe people in the City of Edmonton and other regions across the country had been stewing about for some time, but it was very definitely an initiative of the federal government that got us going on the question.

I'd like to go back and, at the risk of repeating some of Austin's material, give you the background, from the Edmonton perspective, on where this came from. This program of devolution, or it's sometimes referred to as privatization, or decentralization of the airport system, began, to the best of our knowledge, as far back as the late '70s. As Austin mentioned, Don Mazankowski was the Minister of Transport in '85 when the current proposal got kicked off for a second time. It was Mazankowski, the Minister of Transport in the Clark government in '79-80, who commissioned something that came to be called the Haglund report, after its chairman. It basically addressed the question that there should be a better way to handle this airport question. By that time it was becoming pretty apparent that airports were a tool of economic development, in much the same way as railways were in the last century. And, as a tool of economic development, they had to be more responsive, to the local requirements than was the case.

Specifically, some of the problems or issues that had been pointed out:

- Marketing of the airport, or the airport system - and we had seen what was happening in the States where there is some very aggressive marketing. This is true not only in the States, but in other parts of the world. Schiphol in Amsterdam is marketed as an airport, and it very definitely attracts people to Amsterdam.
- Improved economic development potential - simply using the airport to develop the economic potential of the region. That relies on the fact that a good part of business is done as a result of communications, and one part of communications today is getting to see the customer, or getting your product out to market.
- Increased flexibility and responsiveness - in order to use the airports as a tool of economic development you've got to be able to respond quickly.
- Access to capital - airports are capital intensive facilities and the only access to capital, the only pool of capital that airports in Canada had, or have had up to the present, is the Federal Government. Edmonton

Municipal, is an anomaly because it is the only major airport in the country that is not owned by the federal government. Leaving it aside, all the capital has to come from the federal government.

- Efficiency - everybody says that they can do something that somebody else is doing more efficiently.
- Commercial orientation - could we use our airports in a more commercial way?
- Consistent long term policies - business people are generally looking for consistency and a long term indication of what the plans are. There is some difficulty in obtaining those when the ultimate controlling entities are governments who tend to, in many cases, have a shorter focus.
- Local control, local priorities - we have here a major facility in the Edmonton International Airport, that by most measures is a significant factor affecting economic development, and the control of that is 2500 miles away in an office tower in Ottawa.

Those of us who lived in Edmonton in the late '70s, and I think most of us here did, were aware of the general capacity shortcomings at our airport; in fact, the general capacity shortcomings that we had in our whole infrastructure in Edmonton, because Alberta was booming and we were trying to catch up. The airport problem perhaps stood out because we didn't have the ability to deal with it. We couldn't address the problem quickly because we had to go through the decision-making process in Transport Canada. It was 2500 miles away and had all the other pressures being applied to it, with the other parts of the country asking for things. Ultimately, the demands on capital went before the Treasury Board, and then you were competing with somebody who needed a new fishing facility in the Maritimes, or needed some initiative in External Affairs, or the bilingualism program, or whatever the priorities of the government happened to be at that time.

This study that I've mentioned, the Haglund Report, which was done in 1979, and published in 1980, investigated a number of alternatives to deal with those problems: (1) Modification of the existing system. In other words, Transport Canada continued to own it, but how could it be fixed up to be more responsive. (2) A national crown corporation. That's a credible alternative and that's essentially the way the Harbours Board went. (3) A local crown corporation. (4) An airport commission, which was generally defined as one that was still owned by the federal government, but had more local management - a local board, an advisory board, or an economic development council. To some extent, that's part of the concept that Austin referred to earlier that might apply to those airports that don't become devolved totally. (5) Municipal ownership - we have an airport in Edmonton, the municipal airport, that's an anomaly, as most are owned by the federal government. In the United States, most

airports are owned by municipalities. (6) The Airport Authority concept. (7) Private ownership - was an alternative that was looked at in 79-80 and considered pretty radical.

All of these seven alternatives were looked at and private ownership considered the second most attractive of the alternatives. The most attractive was the Airport Authority concept. Private ownership, which was a pretty radical idea at that stage, is not quite so radical today. You may know that the UK have gone all the way to private ownership. They have sold their airport system, the British Airports Authority, to private operators, and these private operators are pretty aggressive. I got a phone call from the British Airports Authority, which is now a private corporation, asking if they could take an equity position in the Edmonton airport system. They are very definitely private enterprise.

The results of the Haglund Report were that the Airport Authority concept was considered the most viable concept and that was what was recommended. That concept is for an independent local authority to own and operate the airport, or airports (this was a national study - not an Edmonton study); that it be a non-profit or not-for-profit organization that would be set up with the essential focus of economic development; that it be operated on a commercial basis; that it have independent access to the capital markets.

In Edmonton, we responded to that recommendation with the establishment of a subcommittee of the Edmonton Air Services Authority. The Edmonton Air Services Authority is an advisory board to the City of Edmonton, to mayor and council, on aviation matters. The Edmonton Air Services Authority, and I sat on that authority at that time, established a subcommittee to examine the application of that concept to the Edmonton area. The subcommittee consisted of members of the Edmonton Air Services Authority, of Transport Canada, Chambers of Commerce, the Province of Alberta, and the airlines. We ran around and looked at a number of alternatives, went down and looked at some of these authorities in the States and, basically, concluded that the concept was applicable in the Edmonton area.

There were a number of benefits. Specifically, the Airports Authority concept provided a lot of evidence for:

- improved economic development potential, commercial orientation - the idea of generating a significant portion of your revenues from non-airline activities, hotels, shopping centres. Schiphol is a good example in that regard. If you can generate a significant amount of revenues from non-airline activities, then generally, you're going to be able to reduce your price to the airlines, and if you reduce your price to the

airlines, you're going to attract more airlines. The name of the game is attracting more service into the community.

- . Aggressive marketing - there has been some joint marketing done in the Edmonton area by Transport Canada, on behalf of the International Airport and the Municipal Airport, but there would be clearly more potential if it was under one management, one ownership with a joint effort.
- . Flexibility, responsiveness - there are all kinds of examples of how we could be much more responsive and flexible. A couple of years ago, the Air Services Authority, (I was not on the authority at this point, but I was informed reliably), were in discussions with CP Air in an attempt to establish a hub (in the hub and spoke scheduling concept) in Edmonton. CP Air were very close to going along with this. One of their requirements was six more bridges. But the approval process, to get through Ottawa, to get six more bridges was going to take 18 months. The opportunity disappeared. If you watch how the Ghermezians can build things here, it doesn't take 18 months to get an approval. I'm not sure we can be that fast, or that we want to be that fast, but we're in a competitive environment.
- . Improved efficiency - again, it's always easy to look and say somebody else is doing a thing in a way, or we can do it in a way, that would be cheaper, but, relatively conservative estimates, (and we've crunched a lot of numbers on this thing), have indicated that it should be possible to operate the airport system in Edmonton at, at least a ten per cent lower cost. That would flow essentially from a reduction in overheads, not from the direct operating costs. But there's a fairly significant overhead cost that is now carried, in part by City Hall in Edmonton, and in part by Transport Canada in Ottawa.
- . Access to the capital markets - I think enough has been said about that. If you can access the capital markets directly, rather than having to go through Treasury Board, inevitably you're going to be able to do it faster.
- . Local control and priorities - clearly, if the thing was owned and operated and managed locally it is going to respond to local priorities.
- . Consistent long term policies - probably the best example in that area is the problem with respect to the long term policies of the Edmonton Municipal, not the federal airport. There is considerable frustration among business people who are contemplating investment possibilities at the Edmonton Municipal airport, but who don't know what the long term future of it is.

So, for all of those reasons, this conceptual study indicated that the Airport Authority concept, as originally brought forward by the federal government, was probably applicable in Edmonton. At that point, and we're now in 1985, this subcommittee of the Air Services Authority realized that if we were going to be proposing something that was an independent authority, then it wasn't very feasible to continue as a subcommittee of something that was an advisory board to the City of Edmonton; not if we wanted to become truly regional. So we created the Edmonton Regional Airports Authority Task Force Association, and that's the thing that I am the chairman of. It is an independent body, set up as a not-for-profit organization under the provincial laws and at that point, we went and got funding from the federal government, from Transport Canada, to do a feasibility study. We did a lot of work between 1985 and 1986, and published the result in the spring of last year.

Basically we examined the feasibility of this concept in detail, in a legislative sense, an organizational sense, an operational sense, and financially. We were looking at the four Edmonton airports; two that are owned by Transport Canada, Edmonton International and Villeneuve, Edmonton Municipal, and a small one that's owned by the province out in Cooking Lake. We looked at legislation, boards of directors, management, staff organization, crunched a whole bunch of numbers, revenues, operating costs, acquisition costs, financing alternatives, the role of the airport - what its objective was going to be - and gradually evolved further this concept of what we were talking about and what we thought was applicable in the Edmonton area as the most feasible model. And that is, again, this Airport Authority.

It is a public corporation, and by public corporation, we mean something that does not have a significant equity base, or significant shareholders, but is financed, essentially, by long term debt in the money market and is an independent body. With that concept, we started talking to the local people to get support.

Bringing myself to the specifics I was asked to talk about - What were the problems? What were the issues that we had to face? Firstly, we had to explain a concept that was relatively new. There was a lot of talking, quite frankly, with politicians and officials in the region. We did not talk to all of them, unfortunately, we simply didn't have time. But we talked to a number of people in the Province, the City of Edmonton, County and City of Leduc, Strathcona, Sturgeon and Parkland. There are a number of other municipalities that we have yet to talk to. But essentially we talked to enough that we could go back to Ottawa and say we could be mandated to acquire airports and put them under an independent body, not consolidate scheduled services.

The two issues got blended in people's minds. Our mandate was not and is not to consolidate air services at either Edmonton International or Edmonton Municipal Airport. Our mandate was to acquire those airports and put them under an independent body which would then operate them on the basis of economic development. Another problem that we faced, was that, in the minds of many people in Edmonton, Edmonton was a buyer of these airports. In fact, Edmonton is a vendor of the municipal airport, so there was a lot of discussion in order to get that point across. The question of accountability was a major one, and I must thank the politicians for accepting that the accountability, at least at this stage, is a little bit loose. What we were asking for was an appointment to act as their agent to negotiate a deal.

Ultimately, the proposal which went forward to Ottawa last month has the Edmonton Regional Airports Authority mandated by seven bodies - the Province of Alberta, the City of Edmonton, and the five surrounding municipalities I mentioned. We propose a funding formula which is 40 per cent from the provincial government, 30 per cent from the City of Edmonton, and 30 per cent from the surrounding municipalities. Those surrounding municipalities may well be extended beyond the five and we will redivide the 30 per cent. The current status is that we made the formal submission to the Minister of Transport in December. As Austin said, we are probably the first off the mark, or the furthest ahead of all the communities in the country. We met with the Deputy Minister last week, we have agreed on a timetable, and we are looking for approval, in principle, to come back to our sponsoring communities in Edmonton, and go to Cabinet by June of this year. We are looking for final legal documentation by December of this year, and implementation by the spring or summer of '89. Thank you very much.

Moderator

Thank you Mr. Watson. Our next presenter is Ms. Carrie Schnelker. She is the Assistant General Counsel for the Port of Seattle Commission. Carrie L. Schnelker, graduated cum laude from Georgetown University Law Centre in 1980, practiced law for three years with Foster, Pepper and Riviera, a 100 lawyer commercial business law firm in Seattle, WA. She joined the Port of Seattle in 1983, and currently is assistant general counsel to the Port of Seattle with an emphasis on aviation affairs. Please welcome Ms. Schnelker.

**Ms. Carrie Schnelker, Assistant General Counsel
Port of Seattle Commission, Seattle, Washington**

Ladies and gentlemen, I think lawyers are notorious for bad jokes and boring speeches, so I won't start with the former, and I'll try not to finish with the latter. I was asked to present a general overview of what Sea-Tac International Airport is. I hope this isn't too centralized to our area. But, the port is a political subdivision of the State of Washington, more specifically a municipal corporation. All our powers to operate our port or our airport derive from the State legislature, which is our real oversight agency. That legislature may act at any time to expand those powers or contract them.

The Port of Seattle was created in 1911, the same year as the enabling legislation for the creation of port districts was enacted, by a vote of the residents of King County, which is the county in which we are located. Seattle-Tacoma International Airport was officially opened in 1947, which was six years after enabling legislation provided for the ownership and operation of airports by port districts, as well as other municipalities. There is of course, the opportunity for private developers to create airports as well.

The Port's boundaries are co-extensive with the County's. However, our powers are independent of the County or the City of Seattle government. What this means, with respect to our port powers, is that we can operate port terminals in marine facilities anywhere in the County, and where we actually create such facilities, neither the City nor the County can interfere with their operation.

With respect to our airport powers, our authority is even broader than our territorial jurisdiction. The statute, giving municipal corporations the power to own and operate airports, actually provides that we may own and operate such airports and air navigation facilities, "within or without" our territorial boundaries, and, "within or without" the State. Putting aside the political questions, this means that we could legally develop a new

airport, for example, in the City of Spokane, WA, or even in another state such as Alaska or Hawaii. I'm lobbying for Hawaii.

The airport statute also provides that we have exclusive jurisdiction over the airport and air navigation facilities, subject of course to State laws, and of course, to federal laws. This means that although Sea-Tac is physically located within King County, the County may not charge any fees for companies operating at the airport; may not require licenses to operate at Sea-Tac; and exercises no control over zoning or land use issues at the airport. This exclusive power, however, is in some cases limited to that property which is actually used for airport purposes, and not simply to that which we may have acquired under the airport statutes, such as that originally acquired for noise purposes, but now used, for example, as an office park. This limitation is most evident in the case of zoning and land use issues. The distinction between the Port's powers regarding zoning and land use and the County's, was made clear by our Washington State Supreme Court in 1981. In reviewing a Boeing Corporate Headquarters building, which was proposed to be built on Port land, the Court stated, "The King County Council is the general governing body that establishes land use policy and regulations in King County. The Port of Seattle, an independent municipal corporation, has complete land use jurisdiction of its airport land, only as long as it utilizes it for airport or airport related purposes. A headquarters building such as the Boeing Company proposes to build, is a non-airport purpose, therefore, King County has jurisdiction and not the Port."

Where zoning issues relate to airport uses, however, the Port clearly has exclusive jurisdiction. Indeed, the airport statute even gives us the power to zone completely outside the airport, where necessary for control of air hazards. This exclusive jurisdiction over the airport operations, and airport-related land use issues also means that, other than through the election of our commissioners, which I'll address in a moment, and through comment at public meetings, the citizens in the area directly surrounding the airport, have little real control over the activities occurring at the airport.

The enormous impact of an airport, operated by one jurisdiction, in the middle of several others, has obviously created numerous tensions. Sea-Tac commenced operation in the late '40s. As noted in the Boeing Corporate Headquarter's case, almost immediately the airport began growing in the volume of its business. As its activity increased, it ultimately needed more area, and expanded to the west. As Sea-Tac increased, in both size and activity, conflict arose between neighboring residents and the Port of Seattle, and continues to this day. For a decade or more, land use controversy has existed between the Port of

Seattle, and persons residing and owning property west of Sea-Tac. Occasionally this tension between the Port and individuals, and between the Port and other jurisdictions, results in attempts to wrest control of the airport from the Port. For example, a group of citizens in the area surrounding the airport, have campaigned to "incorporate" the airport into their own city, hoping to be able to draw from the revenues generated by the airport. These individuals do not realize, however, that any such incorporation would be of little or no effect as the Port would continue to have exclusive jurisdiction over the airport, and the sole ability to exact license fees, etc.

Another attempt to wrest control of the airport from the Port, is a movement to introduce State legislation which would create a regional airport planning authority, something you all might welcome in your area. This movement is a response, however, to the perception that our Port Commission has not done enough to combat noise generated by the airport. The planning authority would be founded on, and let me quote from the proposal, the "need to review and adopt region-wide plans and policies for capital improvements to airports and related facilities" and the necessity for establishing "a regional authority to evaluate and plan for the use of and need for this region's airports and related facilities". This legislation, although state-wide, would only focus on the Puget Sound regional area.

Now, although the planning authority, in concept, may sound like a good idea, the proposed make-up of the planning authority significantly excludes any representation by the Port of Seattle. The planning authority would be comprised of fifteen voting members: the Governor of the State of Washington would appoint the chairman and four residents of Seattle; the Mayor of Seattle would appoint two residents of Seattle; the King County Council, whose boundaries are co-extensive with ours, would appoint four residents of the County who do not reside in the City of Seattle; the Pierce County Executive, and Pierce County is the county which lies directly to the south of Sea-Tac and contains the City of Tacoma, would appoint two residents of Pierce County; and then one each would be appointed by the Counties of Kitsap, which is to the west of Seattle, and Snohomish County which is directly to the north of Seattle. The planning authority would essentially have veto power over any major Sea-Tac project, as its approval would be required for any project in excess of \$2 million; any project which would increase airport operations; projects which allow the operation of larger or noisier aircraft; and finally, projects which increase the airport's noise contour.

Now, although a regional approach per se, may not be inappropriate, the planning authority, as conceived above, would be unworkable as it would merely act to second-guess the decisions made by

the Port of Seattle, with neither responsibility nor accountability - words we've heard a lot today already - for operational decisions. Such proposed legislation, however, demonstrates the need not only to be responsive to the public on issues such as noise, but to inform and educate your public with respect to what your airport is accomplishing, how it is being accomplished, and why alternative methods, although on the surface desirable, may not be workable for your airport.

I've talked about how people would like to see Sea-Tac operated, or how some would. Let me talk to you now about how our airport is actually run. The Port of Seattle, and hence the airport, is run by the people of King County through an elected Board of Directors, the Port of Seattle Commission. The Commission consists of five elected commissioners, elected for six-year terms. Our elections are staggered, with ordinarily no more than two commissioners up for election at any one time; the only exception would be if there were a vacancy in an office occurring during a term. Port Commission elections, therefore, occur every other year. There is no limit to the number of terms a Port commissioner may hold, and in fact we had someone retire recently with approximately 20 years of service. The purpose of the Commission is to set the overall policy for the Port of Seattle. The day-to-day operations, however, are under the direction of the Executive Director for the Port, an officer of the Port appointed by the Commission. That Executive Director, in turn, has a staff of approximately 1,000, of which approximately 300 people are employed predominantly for airport purposes. The airport staff includes professional engineers, real estate managers, operations supervisors, maintenance, etc., all under the direction of the Director of Aviation, who in turn, reports to the Executive Director. A Port economic study, however, suggests that more than 37,000 jobs in King County are related to our airport activities. That would include air carrier activity, as well.

Although the organizational structure of the Port and the policy-setting objective of the Commission suggest limited involvement in the airport's day-to-day operations, the increasing visibility of the Port and our airport operations, and the increased politicizing of the office of Port Commissioner, have periodically increased the role of our Commission in those day-to-day operations. Recently, however, the Commission has delegated far-reaching administrative authority to the Executive Director, on paper anyway, maintaining for the Commission more of an oversight role, and that of policy-setting. This arrangement leaves our Commission free to focus on broader issues relating to the Port. These policy issues will probably include many of those which you will address in the near or far future here; such airport issues as:

. Capacity and growth.

(a) How much parking for your airport should

be provided by the public authority and how much should be provided by the private sector?

- (b) Expansion of the airport. Is a new runway, or indeed a new airport required for us? Should any such expansion be limited to King County, or should we exercise our power to own and operate airports outside our territorial jurisdiction?

- . Noise Issues - this is a policy issue which you will probably need to address, should you strive to turn your airport into a hub operation, thereby increasing your air traffic in and out of Edmonton, and also increasing business to your public, but also the public perception of a noise-generating influence in the community. This is the next big policy issue that we're dealing with, and that is noise issues, and the balancing of the community concerns, with the fact that we are the only major regional airport. Do we represent the community's interest or primarily that of aviation?
- . Development and land usage, which is directly tied to the noise impacts. What is the best use for the land surrounding the airport? How should we best develop land acquired for noise purposes? Should our interest in developing land be primarily that of revenue raising, or more community-oriented? Should land be developed exclusively by the Port, or through private development? If the latter, how much control should we retain? Should we "land-bank", to ensure that land is available for future airport development?
- . Tax subsidy. The Port has historically assessed a tax against property owners in the County, in effect subsidizing our operations. The airport, however, is essentially self-supporting, but cannot be used to subsidize the marine side of the operations. So a major question is whether the Port should eliminate our tax subsidy and strive to become self-supporting across the board.

Again, though, the very fact of having an elected board may increase the opportunity for it to make decisions which are politically expedient, and not necessarily in the best interest of the airport or the Port itself. An elected board also results in occasional one-issue campaigns and commissions. For example, this last election, we had one spot up for election, and the Commission election essentially turned on the issue of noise and how the airport should be addressing that. Two elections ago saw two new commissioners elected, based upon the public perception that the Port of Seattle was not responsive to their needs and did not listen to the public when we, very briefly I might add, changed the name of the airport from Sea-Tac International to Henry M. Jackson International Airport. Very short lived!

The Port cannot, of course, analyze any of these issues in a vacuum. Although I referenced that the Port's powers to operate the airport itself are independent of those of other jurisdictions, these jurisdictions continue to play a part in our operations. The biggest player may be the federal government itself, and although I listen to Austin Douglas telling you all these wonderful things about how you have the opportunity to wrest control from the federal government, I would suggest you take a very close look at what strings may yet be attached to the ability to operate your own airport.

The operation of our airport is heavily regulated by the federal government, with requirements for security, for safety, for noise planning, for zoning, and a host of other issues. The federal government also assists our Port through grants of federal money. That money never comes without strings attached to it. For instance, the concession agreements, for the restaurants and the facilities that you find within the airport, are required to be comprised of a certain percentage of minority and women concessionaires. Property acquired with federal money may have restrictions placed upon its use and restrictions placed upon its ultimate resale. Property cannot be disposed of without certain conditions being met. We, too, are tied to the federal government's priorities. The government collects, essentially, a tax on passengers, and plugs that money back into an airport trust fund. The airports generate that money, yet only the federal government can tell us how to use it and when to spring that money loose. So although we've been generating it, they're essentially sitting on, what I believe is an \$8 billion dollar trust fund at this point, with no control by the airports themselves.

Another impact on the acquisition of money with federal grants is the development of that property which has been acquired for noise purposes. The property, once acquired, is not necessarily needed for airport purposes. We obtain that land. It's not fit for residential use, perhaps, but it might be conducive to a bank, a restaurant, an office park, an air cargo building, or perhaps a hotel facility, with lots of insulation we hope. Because the property was acquired with federal grants, however, any revenue generated by that property will be required, by the federal government, to be plowed back into the airport operations themselves, which thereby results in a reduction in the airlines' landing fees. What then is the incentive to the Port to develop that property, when we do not stand to benefit economically from its development.

Given these restrictions on development of land, and given that development of land is not simply motivated by economic concerns, development at Sea-Tac might best be accomplished through ground leases of the underlying property to private developers, who would actually, create

the improvements. Any such leases, however, are limited by statute to a certain number of years, if I recall, 75 years. A long-term lease to a developer, however, essentially ties your hands for a number of years and may limit future development or expansion of your airport. So one thing I would suggest, in considering your own development of property, I would strongly recommend that you carefully analyze how you will obtain your development monies and whether any strings may attach to your right to develop that property, thereafter.

Another major player is the State of Washington which, as mentioned before, both giveth power and taketh it away. Our primary statutory authority is derived from Title 53 of the Revised Code of Washington, which is the general overall port district statute, and Title 14 which is the general statute giving municipalities, including port districts, the authority to run airports. In addition there are numerous other statutes which tell us how we can, and how we can't, operate.

There are restrictions imposed by those statutes:

- . The Port only has those powers specifically given to us by statute, or necessarily implied by that grant.
- . The Port is required by statute, for instance, to competitively bid its contracts for work over a certain dollar amount.
- . The Port is required to conduct its meetings in open public session, which is essentially government in a fish bowl.
- . The Port is required, upon request, to disclose many of its records, even those which we believe should remain confidential. This may restrict the number of entities willing to do business with us when, in essence, their business may become public as well.
- . The Port may not enter into any contracts where a commissioner may appear to have an interest in that contract. I'm sure that's similar here.
- . The Port is required to perform extensive environmental review and perform an environmental impact statement before proceeding with major action. This would clearly include any decision to expand our airport.
- . The Port is limited on its aviation leases to a certain number of years.

And always, there is the threat that a power, once given, may be taken away, as with the proposal to establish a regional planning authority, which would essentially take away the Port's right to control development of the airport.

Another player is King County, the County in which we're located. Its involvement is, in many ways, more political than jurisdictional. With respect to actual airport operations, as discussed earlier, however, questions of overlapping jurisdiction do arise where the Port has acquired property, say for noise impact purposes, that is not then dedicated to an "airport purpose". In addition, the Port has at several times considered jointly developing property with the County. For instance, we considered joint development of a police firing range. Currently, the Port is considering transferring some of its property to the County for use as a park and for recreational facilities. These instances of mutual interest, and the overlap of the Port and the County on zoning and land use issues, on the airport side and on the marine side, allow the County to hold hostage some of the airport issues. It is not, in other words, in our interest to play hardball. I suppose that's a peculiarly US expression; it's not in our interest to play Wayne Gretzky against the County over airport issues.

In addition, the County exerts considerable influence over the airport, in that the major developments abutting our airport, all lie within unincorporated King County, which means they are not within a city, but within the unincorporated portion of King County. The hotels, the restaurants, the parking lots, the office tower buildings, which you may have noticed are just a stone's throw from our terminal facility, all lie outside our jurisdiction and within the jurisdiction of the County. The Port has no real control over that development, nor can we exact any economic benefit from these entities, other than perhaps a de minimus fee charged to, for instance, the hotel shuttle buses picking up passengers from the airport. The County, however, should ensure that its development of those adjacent properties is not incompatible with the use of the airport, and is not incompatible with future development of the airport.

Two more entities bear upon us. The City of Seattle less directly impacts the airport operations. Its citizens and the citizens of other areas, such as the City of Bellevue, the City of Mercer Island, a very affluent community to the east of Seattle, the Cities of Des Moines and Tukwila, which are directly adjacent to the airport operations, are directly impacted by the noise generated by the airport. Each of these municipalities, therefore, remains continually aware of, and vocal with respect to airport issues. Then a regional group, known as the Puget Sound Council of Governments, which sounds in some ways like this planning commission, is comprised of almost all of the local governments in the Puget Sound area, basically a four county area. As part of their mission to promote regional policies, they took it upon themselves, recently, to investigate and report on the future of the regional airports, establishing

guidelines and making recommendations for the development and operation of major air carrier airports (read Sea-Tac) as well as general aviation airports in the area, with respect to local land use issues and capital improvements. Clearly, the Port cannot operate totally independent of these organizations.

Finally, the last influence that you cannot disregard is that of the private institutions which you are required to deal with. For instance, a private developer is actively promoting development of a partial south access to our airport, which would increase the value of his property. However, this promotion fails to consider the impact of only partially creating such access and the need for an ultimate link-up to two major state highways. Basically, he's approaching it in a piecemeal fashion to benefit his particular property. Another major influence is, for instance, our latest new air cargo facility, which was exclusively developed by a private developer. And, finally, perhaps the most important private influence is that of the airline carriers themselves. The Port originally entered into long-term leases with the basic airline carriers. Those leases tie our hands for a good number of years. I believe we have about a decade left on those leases. Under those lease arrangements the airlines have to approve every major capital improvement which we make. This, again, is something to consider, when you're thinking about how you want to develop your airport.

Does this review lead us to any conclusions? From my review, I may suggest something that's diametrically opposed to what this organization consists of, but I would suggest that an airport would be better operated under the authority of one jurisdiction and one entity. That does not mean that your entity may not be comprised of representatives from some of the various jurisdictions, and that does not mean that you cannot escape the regional influence. However, you need one authority that makes the decisions and is not routinely second-guessed by every one of the other regional jurisdictions. Thank you.





**Preserving Natural
Areas For Fun
and Profit**



PRESERVING NATURAL AREAS FOR FUN AND PROFIT

Moderator: Mayor Lee Danchuk
Town of Bon Accord, Alberta

My name is Lee Danchuk, I'm the mayor of Bon Accord, and the Chairman of the Planning Committee. I'll be the moderator for this session on "Preserving natural areas for fun and profit." We have four guest speakers this morning and after we finish the presentations this morning, we'll have questions and group discussion this afternoon.

Natural areas are generally perceived to be isolated locations preserved exclusively for wildlife. They are usually associated with bird sanctuaries, or the large back country areas in Canada's national parks. Quite often, however, the potential for use and the resultant social and economic benefits are overlooked, or even unknown. After all, what possible use or benefit could be gained from an area preserved exclusively for plants and animals. This session investigates the possibilities of using natural areas for recreational pursuits and promoting this use for the social benefits and the economic spin-off in the surrounding communities.

Our first speaker this morning is Mr. Gerald McKeating. Mr. McKeating is Program Head, Habitat Conservation for the Western and Northern Region of the Canadian Wildlife Service, Environment Canada. Prior to his appointment to Edmonton, he was located in Ontario, where he was actively involved in urban wildlife issues. He obtained his Masters Degree in Environmental Studies from York University, where he specialized in the protection of natural areas in urban environments. I'd like to introduce Mr. Gerald McKeating to you now. Thank you.

**Mr. Gerald McKeating, Program Head, Habitat Conservation,
Canadian Wildlife Service, Environment Canada,
Edmonton, Alberta**

Thanks, Lee. In the fifteen minutes that we have, I'll try to go through, rather quickly, the various thoughts that I have on this particular topic. As you'll find out, I feel strongly about it, having been much involved, and having come from the great wilderness of southwestern Ontario. When you go through miles of urbanization, you develop an appreciation of just how important open space is. When I moved to Edmonton, to give a bit of personal background, we deliberately chose to buy a house in the Mill Creek area, because of the access to

the ravine system, and the open space that was there. To us, as individuals, it was the best of both worlds and important in the urban context.

There are few cityscapes that have escaped the impact of urbanization, but we can still find, in urban areas, diverse habitats; ravines, grassland, aspen forest, or prairie slough. One can argue, at great length, on the philosophical and biological values of such natural areas, however, at this time, it is sufficient to suggest that we should take a broader environmental view of the city, one that is in tune with urban natural processes, and not one that fights to replace them with a continuum of biological sterility. I think that we need to minimize order and form, and by so doing, many rich environments can be added to the urban open space system at minimum cost. And yes, I believe that weeds and untidiness have a place in the city landscape.

I'd like to try to make an attempt to place some economic values on urban areas and recreational activities. In a comprehensive survey, conducted by Statistics Canada in 1982 and sponsored by federal/provincial wildlife agencies across the country and a number of non-governmental groups, it was revealed, statistically, that wildlife resources were highly valuable to the nation as a whole. The study, which questioned approximately 100,000 Canadians from all regions and walks of life, gauged the importance and their attitude towards wildlife. The study detailed the amount of participation and expenditures which were incurred and wildlife related activities emerged as one of the most prevalent forms of recreation undertaken by Canadians. In 1981, the year the study was undertaken, the majority of the Canadian population, fifteen years of age or older, was involved in some form of wildlife related activity. That was 83.8 per cent of the Canadian population. And let me explain a little bit about the survey. This was a well thought out programme, undertaken by Stats Can and there are a number of booklets and detailed statistical analysis of the various recreation programmes which are available.

Those participants provided an important stimulus to the Canadian economy by spending an estimated 4.2 billion dollars on wildlife related activities. That estimate excludes the commercial value of wildlife, such as furs or whatever. The study further revealed that as many as one in five Canadians undertook trips for the primary purpose of observing, studying or photographing wildlife. The average participant spent about \$600 per year and over

15 days on such trips throughout the year. So that activity alone had a value of 2.1 billion dollars. This survey also revealed that Canadians value the conservation of wildlife, with about 80 percent stating that the maintenance of wildlife populations was important to them. Clearly the maintenance of wildlife cannot be achieved without the protection of natural areas and wildlife habitat upon which wildlife depends.

An examination of the survey results reveals a high level of interest across the country, but especially in the west. These data, with respect to Alberta, indicated that participation rates and concern, were in all areas of questioning, much higher than the national average. Expenditures on wildlife related activities in Alberta had been estimated to be, through the study, \$550 million. Those expenditures are related to binoculars, film, equipment, clothing, transportation to various areas where people recreate. This has a significant impact on our economy through income, employment and tax revenue within our province. An update of these data will be undertaken during February 1988. Data will be banked and analysed this year with publication scheduled for 1989. I was tempted to try to break the information down to the municipal level, and I hope that we can eventually do that, but if you take the population of your area, and the proportion that is of Alberta's, you get a gross estimate as to the economic value to your municipality.

As an example of specific data, closer to home, Edmonton is the home of the John Janzen Nature Centre. In 1985, this facility hosted approximately 80,000 visitors and sponsored over 1200 nature related programs. In 1986 they had an annual bird seed sale, and sold approximately 25 tons of bird seed, resulting in gross revenue to the centre of over \$30,000. And that's in one weekend! In 1986 they received over 5,000 calls asking for natural history information. Those statistics from one small centre, indicate some of the economic spinoffs, but more importantly, the level of interest and participation in urban areas in wildlife activities. In 1987, attendance at the same centre was the highest ever, with over 95,000 people visiting. And at their annual October birdseed sale, they had over 3000 people turn out on one weekend. Now, clearly, the centre, in the heart of Edmonton, is an important component of the recreational facilities for Edmontonians.

A similar example is provided by the Capital City Recreation and Parks programme. Apart from the Janzen Centre, that agency delivers numerous programs which provide wildlife experiences. In 1986 the agency provided 174 interpretive type programmes, with an attendance of over 25,000 people. I suggest that statistics would be similar for other urban areas throughout Alberta. The Gaetz Lakes natural area in Red Deer, about which you will hear more from

Michael O'Brien, and the Inglewood Migratory Bird Sanctuary in Calgary, are both heavily used areas for walking, bird watching and for just a general experience in a natural open space environment. I visited the Inglewood Sanctuary one cold January Sunday morning and was astonished at the number of people visiting this site. The parking lot was filled to capacity and the trail system filled with people from all walks of life who were participating in wildlife oriented activities, from feeding ducks in the Bow River to enticing chickadees to take seed from their hands.

Visitor statistics for several of the small local natural areas - out Stony Plain way, for example, are the Clifford E. Lee Sanctuary and the Wagner Bog - clearly indicate that there is a large interest in that type of area. One of the most important features, to me at least, is that those areas are easily accessible to the majority of urban people who do not have to spend half a day travelling to a site. People go there for an outdoor nature experience, without having to travel far from the City. The demand has grown over the last three to five years and I believe it is safe to suggest that it will continue.

The economic effects of such activity, not to mention the improvement in the quality of urban life, could be considerably enhanced with the creation of other natural areas, close to or within urban centers. If areas like the Lee Sanctuary and Wagner Bog have an annual visitation of approximately 5,000 people each and that the travel costs generated would, say, be \$2 a visit, that's a \$10,000 expenditure per site which would not have otherwise occurred. Multiply that by each new area created and it would not take too long to identify the additional new expenditures that could accrue to a municipality. In my view, this will hold true for the promotion of trumpeter swan viewing in Grande Prairie and Saskatoon Lake, to Edmonton, Calgary, Medicine Hat, or other urban centers where there are some significant natural features.

Within Edmonton, there are many areas that could be conserved and protected for nature appreciation and the associated recreational values. David Ealey, in a study he conducted in 1986 and '87 for the city, identified over 1,000 areas within the Edmonton boundaries which have some significant natural values and could be of interest for wildlife oriented activities. Those areas range from woodlots in the river valley to prairie sloughs adjacent to the Yellowhead Highway. Of those thousand sites, there were about 30 which were particularly significant. Efforts are clearly needed to ensure that some of those sites are protected, not only for those inherent philosophical values about preserving nature, because it's there, but for the recreation and economic benefits that they could generate.

One area just northwest of Edmonton is Big Lake, a significant natural area that has engendered widespread public interest, and stretches into four different municipalities. A comprehensive planning programme has been undertaken with the participation of a variety of agencies. In my view, Big Lake has some extraordinary recreational potential by providing urban residents with an excellent opportunity to engage in wildlife oriented activities. The lake is an important area for the staging of waterfowl and other species, and it ranks as one of the 20 most important sites for ducks in the Province of Alberta. Parts of the area are classified as being environmentally sensitive, but you can skate, cross-country ski, fish, waterfowl hunt, walk, birdwatch, engage in a whole variety of activities, which, for the most part, would be in harmony with that natural area.

I'm well aware that in such an urban area, conflicts for development or change are undoubtedly extreme. But I urge that municipalities, when trying to sort out these conflicts, must give very careful consideration to the wildlife oriented economic and recreational activities that accrue; rather than dismissing out of hand, that type of activity, in the mistaken impression that only a few enjoy it and no economic benefits are to be gained. Now, I think that that state of mind is, to a large degree, our fault because we have not gone out to the communities and to the decision-makers to try to make a case as to what economic values and recreational values can be gained.

One last example of an activity which clearly indicates an interest in wildlife in urban areas is the annual Christmas bird count. This has been a long-standing program throughout North America. In Edmonton, the 1986 Christmas count involved over 500 volunteer participants while in '87 that figure increased to over 1200. That number makes Edmonton the center with the highest number of participants in North America. Admittedly, a lot of hype went into the organization of this activity, but nevertheless the number of people who combed the ravines and back lanes or who were just interested enough to count birds in their back yard is a dramatic indicator of the level of interest. Multiply that by the number of people, who throughout the year, may plant shrubs or trees attractive to wildlife or feed birds, then, you have a dramatic example of the public interest. For example, in a square mile of the Duggan district in Edmonton there were about eighty homes who engaged in bird feeding - a microcosm of the interest throughout the City, as a whole. And I presume that around in my area there are probably twenty to twenty five percent who do the same thing.

So what can municipalities do about conservation of natural areas? First of all, approach the issue with an open mind. Municipalities, like Tofield, Grande Prairie or Slave Lake all

possess amenities which can add to the economic base of the town. And, to comment on Slave Lake for example, I've been asked to lead a trip to Yellowknife at the end of June and we'll be staying for a couple of nights in the Slave Lake area. We're staying there solely on the basis of the natural features and we'll probably leave \$1500 to \$2000 behind.

I remember, back in the mid-70s when I was a graduate student in Metropolitan Toronto, studying a natural ravine system which was surrounded by urban development. Make no mistake, when we surveyed the residents they clearly believed that this natural area was important to them. That point of view is consistent in many areas across Canada and, in Alberta, you can find the same interest in Calgary or Red Deer; people who want, indeed, demand that the natural values within their communities be protected. Think about the controversy in Calgary about Nosehill Park.

Urban areas offer much opportunity for the enjoyment and enhancement of nature, but we tend to think only in terms of protection of key sites, rather than looking at the area as a whole. I believe that the City, itself, is one large wildlife habitat. And what do I mean by that? I want you to look at the City as to what we have, and take advantage of it. Abandoned industrial sites and vacant lots can support a surprisingly rich wildlife community. Some areas that are closed off to the public become desirable nature reserves, solely through their lack of use and the ecological reclamation by nature.

While in England in '86 I visited a rather small area within the Port of Liverpool. This area was surrounded by industry and the container port and it was littered with construction rubble. Yet, within this industrial zone a wetland thrived to such an extent that it had been designated by the local nature trust as a nature reserve. Birds were abundant. Trails had been established and viewing blinds erected. Thus in the heart of Liverpool, a rich wildlife experience was available.

Biological inspiration can be found in back lanes, sewage ponds, railway right-of-ways and even factory roof tops. There are many secret places, if only we are innovative enough to make the best use of them. One of the most famous industrial sites in Canada is the Leslie Street Spit on Toronto's Waterfront. This is an industrial site but, by accident, it created one of the most spectacular wildlife gatherings in Ontario, if not all of Canada. Ring-billed gulls by the many thousands (to the extent that gulls are really quite a pest in that part of the world), common terns, waterfowl, all became established. This recreation facility and wildlife habitat cost the taxpayer of the City of Toronto and of Metro virtually zero. It's a great place to bike, to walk, to get away from the maddening throng, and is only a bus ride

away.

Other important areas are sewage lagoons, as curious as that might seem. They are rich in nutrients and support a diverse association of invertebrates, consequently birds are attracted. The Gold Bar facility in Edmonton, with its warm outflow into the North Saskatchewan, provides winter habitat for waterfowl by keeping the river free of ice. You can walk out there today and probably find a thousand mallards and a few other species. I've walked along that trail many times and been impressed by the number of people who, as part of their other activity, whether that be skiing or just walking, have shown considerable interest in the ducks on the river. How do you put a value on that kind of experience? I can't.

The urban land environment is also full of regenerating landscapes. I mentioned I live in Mill Creek Ravine. It's a great example of an area which has been reclaimed. In the old days it was part of a coal mine and the railroad ran from the Gainers plant, down through the valley and across the Low Level Bridge. That old railroad bed has now been rehabilitated and is a fine walking, skiing, running trail. The landscape still shows signs of impact but natural regeneration has virtually covered the scar. And it is also useful for wildlife and for associated recreation.

I believe that industry can have considerable interest in rehabilitating their own sites and I believe the opportunity exists to work closely with them to achieve wildlife goals. As an example, we put together a reclamation handbook that has generated a tremendous interest from industry and planning agencies, within Alberta and other parts of the country. We have distributed over 400 so far which, to me, indicates the level of interest by the industrial community.

Industrial sites can provide a wildlife corridor so necessary to wildlife for its survival. Why can't we look at hydro right-of-ways, railway right-of-ways and make them an integral part of our urban wildlife protection? Linking them to more natural landscapes or key natural areas is important. Why can't we undertake some landscaping in some of these otherwise dreary areas? Institutional land management always surprises me. Those vast areas of vacant land require maximum energy input from minimum output. The huge cost involved in right-of-way maintenance in roadsides would, with some alteration to our mowing regime and maintenance regime, be reduced simply by leaving natural edges where mowing is unnecessary; thus creating a more aesthetic environment and also more areas for wildlife habitat. It can be done easily and, I think, without too much cost.

As desolate as some residential areas are, they too can be transformed into sites of diverse habitat, merely by replicating some ecological

principles in some areas. Residential areas can become more pleasing to the eye and highly attractive to song birds. I suggest that municipalities, as part of their part-time educational programmes, include courses dealing with backyard habitat and how to attract the wildlife.

Oases of green exist among our concrete deserts. We must learn to take advantage of their existence, to link the back lanes, the gardens, the remnant wood lots, together with the natural areas which remain and hopefully we can protect. By merging some of those interests we will have surprisingly diverse habitat, both for wildlife and for ourselves. Natural areas can provide us with economic benefits, recreational benefits and, I submit, psychological ones as well, merely by providing us with a more pleasant environment in which to live. Thank you.

Moderator

Our next speaker is the Executive Director for the Fort Whyte Centre for Environmental Education near Winnipeg. Mr. Bill Elliott was born and raised in the Winnipeg, Manitoba area and received his Bachelor of Science Honours Degree in zoology from the University of Manitoba in 1972. He later obtained his Masters of Natural Resource Management from the University of Manitoba in 1977. After graduation he became a Provincial Habitat Development Biologist with Ducks Unlimited Canada. Between 1978 and 1983 he was Development Director for the Delta Waterfowl and Wetlands Research Station and he is currently the Executive Director of the Fort Whyte Centre. May I introduce Mr. Bill Elliott.

Mr. Bill Elliott, Executive Director
Fort Whyte Centre for Environmental Education,
Fort Whyte, Manitoba

Thank you Mayor Danchuk. Ladies and Gentlemen, fellow speakers. Before getting on with my presentation on the Fort Whyte Centre, I want to say what a pleasure it is for me to have this opportunity to take the Fort Whyte Centre story out-of-Province for the first time. However, I do want you to know that it is not without great personal sacrifice, as I recently declined a similar invitation from a private group in Charleston, South Carolina so that I could enjoy Edmonton in January. One of the consolations to my declining that was, I thought, the fact that I would not have to acclimatize, coming from Winnipeg. However, that wasn't the case because I left, yesterday, -29° in a stiff breeze. The kind of weather where your car just warms up as you are getting to the place where you want to go. And I arrived here and it was -2! It's just an extraordinary difference in temperature. Great, great winter you have been having, it's just too bad we don't have some more snow cover. But my being here today, the Charleston invitation, and the increasing number of inquiries that we are entertaining from other existing and planned interpretative centres throughout North America, bear testimony, not only to the increasing profile of the Centre, but also the growing interest in preserving natural areas for fun and profit.

On the aircraft, yesterday, I read the results of a survey conducted last fall that ranked the concern of Canadians for the environment as second only to world peace and unemployment and well ahead of inflation, the deficit and certain other pressing economic issues. Never before have we had such a fertile political ground to promote careful stewardship of our natural world and environmentally sensitive recreational use, where appropriate.

Our theme, today, is "Preserving Natural Areas

for Fun and Profit." Well, from a Fort Whyte perspective, one out of two ain't bad. We offer fun but are still working on the profit end of things. But we'll get to the economics of our operation a little later. However, I do wish to emphasize that we are not in the business of fun nor in the business for profit. The Fort Whyte Centre is in the business of environmental education which yields, I think, valuable dividends of a non-financial nature; namely, an increasing understanding and appreciation of the natural world, and how we all fit into that world. As any teacher worth his or her salt knows, blending the right amount of entertainment and fun into education enhances the lesson and ensures the intended long lasting results.

Now if you have something that is fun and entertaining, chances are that it is marketable. And it follows, if it is marketable, and marketed effectively, there is a profit in it. So fun and profit can and do play an important role in the Centre's environmental education mandate, but not to the detriment of our programmes or natural resources. So, by way of several slides, I want to take you on a pictorial tour. It might be a bit of a whirlwind tour to stay on schedule. I want to show you just a bit of the natural setting, the history, and human resources, facilities and programmes, ending with a review of our 1987 financial performance. And, please, I encourage you to compare what I show you here to the potential at Big Lake, and those other natural areas where you might be able to make the same application and draw the same parallels and differences.

In my history with the waterfowl biological area I've sat on hundreds and hundreds of seminars where the biologists, presenting the talk, ended with a sunset shot. I made a personal promise to myself that I would never end a slide show with a sunset, but I never made the same promise about starting a slide show with a sunset. There's my sunset shot taken on the site. This is the kind beauty you can capture within an urban setting, as long as you give the wildlife and the natural physical resources a chance to produce these kind of scenes.

Canada Cement Lafarge, in 1912, began excavating what they called pits and what we called lakes; four large lakes for a certain quality of clay used in the making of portland cement. In the mid-70s, the Wildlife Foundation of Manitoba started to look at the site, with an eye to developing a nature centre there, knowing that once the industry had finished with the excavation and had mined the site they would have no further use for it. So my visionary Chairman of the Board, Alan Scarth who is with the Wildlife Foundation in Manitoba (of which the Fort Whyte Centre is a project) negotiated a settlement between the Province of Manitoba, Canada Cement Lafarge and the Wildlife Foundation. Canada Cement Lafarge got the mineral rights to the land to the north, the

Province got title to the lake area and the uplands, and the Wildlife Foundation got a 99 year exclusive management jurisdiction agreement over the entire site. So while it is crown land, we control it for 99 years without any government interference whatsoever.

We've raised two million dollars to build the facility and, in return, the Province has agreed to cover our municipal and school taxes. So they make a grant straight to the Provincial Government, which is a good saving for us as we're facing taxes of about \$25,000 a year.

An Alberta based group gave the lynch pin contribution of \$950,000 to our \$2 million target. Once they did that, people perked up and followed suit with smaller denominations, but still significant, and allowed us to complete the project.

The building is an exhibit unto itself, inside and out. It has won a design award from the Architectural Institute of Canada and is really a magnificent place. On your first visit you are struck, not by the property or the natural resources, but by the building. On the second visit you start to get into the property bit. The building is located within a 188 acre area. We have an excellent marsh, with a board walk through it, a waterfowl garden area, a wildlife refuge, lots of nature trails through the woodlands and, of course, lots and lots of water. We do have industrial activity on the south side, and also, unfortunately, an auto wreckers, which is a real eyesore, but we're buffering that with plantings.

We are virtually 20 minutes from Portage and Main, and it's just an extraordinary transition from that area to here.

Canada geese are one of our big attractions in the spring. We get about 12 nests in the property and lots of goslings all over the place. They are a big attraction. In the fall we get thousands of geese and ducks staging here, much like you have at Big Lake. Winnipeg has one of the largest urban white-tail deer herds in North America. It's quite unique. We have about 600 of them and they are actually now trapping them and moving them out because they are getting into people's back yards, chewing shrubs and getting hit by cars and causing our auto insurance rates to go up.

Fox are common on the property, as well as mink, weasel, racoon, skunk. All are terrible predators on waterfowl nests, but we manage to control that, somewhat. We have probably 25 muskrats on our property and our marsh area. We have a waterfowl wintering room, where we keep our waterfowl for about 5 months of the year and then in spring, summer and fall we will put them out in our waterfowl garden area. A computer generated sign states, "Make a splash, ask about our help a honk, help a duck programme." This is just one small programme that generates money

for the centre. You have to add up a lot of little programmes before you can cover a budget such as ours.

Waterfowl offer a tremendous teaching tool and entertainment item for the general public and school kids, alike. They offer such diversity, in terms of colour, shape, behaviour, their vocabulary if you will, and they are always doing something. At a zoo everything is lying around sleeping and not doing anything. Waterfowl go non-stop.

We have a major aquarium under construction, a \$300,000 aquarium, so we are going to bring some of Manitoba's native species of fish right to the noses of the kids and the public. We have fish, which I'll get to a little later, in all our lakes and which we exploit quite considerably. We have Phase 2 planned for this aquarium. It will be a 2 or 3 million dollar undertaking and will be a major major tourist attraction. This, alone, will be a big boost to the centre.

Live exhibits are the best things you can have. A little bee hive cost us nothing. A guy volunteered to give us the bees and another volunteer, a cabinet maker, made the hive. We put it up and it operates year round with no maintenance except for cleaning the glass. We even had the queen bee numbered with a blue tag in her back. It is a fascinating exhibit and it takes up about as much room as this podium.

We have a touch museum where we really encourage hands-on activities. Any exhibits we have in there are dispensable. The kids come in, feel them, touch them, drop them, destroy them. It's no problem. We just look for replacements. It's a real hodge podge museum, but the kids love it. As well, we have a book shop in the building, a library, a theatre and lots of group areas for instructional purposes. So a lot of floor space is required for something like this.

Our waterfowl gardens are a \$250,000 investment of the Caroline Sifton Foundation. We bring together the major wetland habitats that exist in Manitoba within a 20 minute walk. We put the appropriate species of waterfowl in each exhibit and try to landscape as closely as possible. Of course that's a challenge for the tundra wetlands. But we truck in granite from northeastern Manitoba to give it a tundra look, and we use plants that look like the plants you find in the tundra. It's a very unique exhibit because wetlands, as many of you know, are a threatened resource in this country, and it's important to bring the urban population, of 650,000 in Winnipeg, out to see this in a 20 minute walk.

Another thing we make sure we do is to get people out into the wetlands. We have a lot of water on our property and it's no good keeping people on the edge of it. You've got to get them right into it, up to their elbows and their knees. Our floating boardwalk gets them right

into the middle, and of course kids enjoy it immensely. They fall off every second day, which causes a great roar from the kids, but they really experience it. It's an excellent asset, and if you are ever going to do anything with water, anywhere, make sure you budget for a floating boardwalk. And make it floating so that people know they are on water. I don't like those boardwalks that have big posts and are just like a sidewalk. Give people the sensation that they're in there.

School kids are our major clientele, 20,000 a year. That's a tremendous demand. We have teachers phoning in January to book in October. We have programmes going right through the school year. Although, as you'll find out a little later, it's the deficit part of our programme, we use it because it's a wholesome part of our programme, and so we use it effectively in fund raising. In our office area we have a sign that says, "to hear is to forget, to see is to remember and to do is to understand." And we're really big on the "do" part. So all our programmes are geared to getting the kids doing things themselves. So we spend very little time introducing. We get them outside. We take away some of their senses and force them to use others. We make onion trails in the woods and the kids have to get on their hands and knees, blindfolded, and smell their way and find the onion. We have a "meet a tree" programme where the children have to find out what the tree feels like, tastes like and smells like, without their eyes. Then the blindfold is taken off and they try to find the tree with their eyes. We take advantage of puddles left by rain the day before, and this ties in with what Gerald was saying. You can take nature into your back yard; there is a lot to interpret in the back yards and back lanes of the city. You don't have to be in an extensive nature centre to do something like this. The kids are fascinated.

For the older kids in the high school we have wildlife management courses. Radiotelemetry is illustrated by putting a radio collar around their necks or in their pocket, letting one of the students have a head start and, then, ten minutes later the other kids take out their equipment and their aerial and try to track the person down and corner him.

You want these kids to bring something home with them. Of course with the school year, 6 months in Winnipeg is winter, so we have to plan programmes in the winter. And we go non-stop in the winter. We build snow huts for a winter survival programme. All the snow is excavated and the children climb in and have a great time. These things are popping up in the back yards all over Winnipeg because the kids come home with this great idea. Mind you, it's probably dad doing it, and the kids are sitting there watching it. Part of the winter survival programme is outdoor cooking; how to make a fire in the winter and how to keep it going. We also create a labyrinth of straw bale tunnels to show

kids how active small mammals are in the winter, using the snow as an insulating blanket. Once we get the teacher convinced to go through the tunnel, it's no problem for the kids. They follow. But they are quite intimidated, because down there is just a big black hole. But, then again, they go home, talk about it and they bring their families out, because they've had a good, memorable time.

Volunteer Factor - I have a full time volunteer co-ordinator. We have about 80 volunteers active in the centre. Forty-five of them would be volunteer interpreters. Another 30 would be volunteer receptionists who allow us to compress about a year and a half's operation into one year. We're open every day but Christmas, and in the evenings, on demand. We are open a lot of evenings because cubs, girl guides and offices and companies are booking our facilities for meetings. Our programme would be about two-thirds the size it is now, if we didn't have volunteers. They contribute at least two, or maybe three positions a year, a saving to us of \$40,000 to \$50,000. There are interpretive centres in California where volunteers actually pay to volunteer. They come in, put \$10 down, and volunteer for a three hour period to take kids around and then go home, because it is such a privilege. Volunteer recognition is an important part of the programme. They are a part of the family. They are very important.

We have released rainbow trout on Canada Day, held archery and canoeing classes, and pancake breakfasts to get people out early in the morning when your chances of seeing more, in terms of wildlife, are much better. Easter egg painting. We explain the development of an egg. We have a young anglers' programme. We incorporate aquatic biology and give them a course. We get a large crowd out when we have ice fishing. On one Canada Day programme, it was pouring with rain but 550 people came out on that day. They just got muddy and wet.

I don't have time to go over the financial statement, which is unfortunate, but I will leave it with you as information as to what our situation is at the Centre. I hope that what I've presented on the Centre has been of interest to you and, perhaps, served as one case study on the theme of preserving natural areas for fun and profit. I emphasize one, as there will obviously be many different approaches, appropriate for many different situations. At Fort Whyte our approach is working well and I thank you for your attention and look forward to this afternoon's session.

Moderator

Thank you Bill. That was very enlightening and maybe everybody will have a chance to look at the financial statement in this afternoon's discussion period.

Our next guest speaker is Mr. Michael O'Brien from the Gaetz Lake Sanctuary Committee in Red Deer. Mr. O'Brien is a native Albertan with a long-term interest in environmental issues and in planning. Educated at the University of Alberta, he taught high school English and Drama in Edmonton and then spent 5 years in the Canadian Arctic, as a community school principal. Attracted to Red Deer by its parks and recreation system, Michael taught school there and joined Access Alberta as an educator and innovator in the instructional use of radio and television. Disemployed by recent provincial funding cutbacks, Michael now has more time to act as a volunteer and an environmental advocate and to create audiovisual productions. I would like to introduce Mr. Michael O'Brien.

**Mr. Michael O'Brien, Member
Gaetz Lake Sanctuary Committee,
Red Deer, Alberta**

Thanks. Ladies and Gentlemen.

Although I now call Red Deer my home I spent over half my life in your zone, having been born and raised in Fort Saskatchewan and then spent a dozen years here in Edmonton.

My remarks will centre on Red Deer this morning, a place I think that I prefer to my previous locations. There, I'm involved with an organization called the Red Deer River Naturalists, the first and oldest natural history group in Alberta and an organization whose views I will be referring to today.

The abstract which I submitted for this session was a paper titled, "The Gaetz Lakes Sanctuary: The Preservation of a Unique Natural Resource." I will include, in my remarks, a synopsis of that paper, illustrated with some slides of Red Deer's new Waskasoo Park, but I'll also branch into my personal observations on the planning process, as it applied to the creation of that park; a process which managed, by and large, to consider and to successfully avoid many of the kinds of problems which are inherent in the self-contradictory task of trying to develop a natural area, or as the more cynical might say, "to plunder for profit."

The key ingredient, as I see it, in avoiding charges of plunder was that the planning for our new urban park included extensive public participation and input. The benefits resulting

from that participation have been marked, both in regards to the preservation of important natural areas, in and around Red Deer; the appropriate, popular and sensitive development of other areas; and the climate of respect and goodwill that has been established between environmental groups, the park planners and the City of Red Deer administration and Council.

Structured opportunity for citizen input was invited, received, heeded and then acted upon. Both the environment and the ratepayers of the City and the region have been the beneficiaries, as have those businesses which benefit from tourist dollars and from the sales to local residents of outdoor recreational materials, supplies and equipment.

First, let's have a look at this Waskasoo Park and the natural jewel at its centre, the Gaetz Lake Sanctuary.

In June of 1981, the Provincial Government announced a new urban parks programme for the Cities of Red Deer, Grande Prairie, Lethbridge, Lloydminster and Medicine Hat. The stated goal of this programme was "the establishment of significant areas of open space to ensure populations have easy access to natural environments; and the development of these areas to enable their sustained and unimpaired use for outdoor recreation." In terms of this goal, the sum of \$29 million was assigned to Red Deer from the Heritage Trust Savings Fund for the development of a major urban park to serve the City and its region. These funds were made available for land acquisition, planning and capital development. The City requested the Red Deer Regional Planning Commission to prepare a master plan and work with the Recreation Department to co-ordinate the development of the newly named Waskasoo Park.

The Recreation Department had a goodly number of ideas and plans up its own sleeve. For several years it had been hiring temporary summer students to help do studies that looked into the kinds of opportunities and facilities which were lacking in and around the City and into the recreational interests of the full spectrum of citizens in the region; not only the views of those citizens who regularly use the recreational facilities but also into the interests of those citizens who were currently non-users. These student studies also looked at lands into which a wide variety of facilities could most suitably be placed - both within and outside existing City boundaries.

The land acquisition issue was made easier to study because generations of City administrations had carefully husbanded the river valleys and the wooded escarpment, as well as the two creek valleys that run through the City and into the river. Development permits, generally, had been denied for these areas. I would also like to mention that 10 percent of the land development costs were almost always

taken in land, rather than money and that land had been set aside for future park use, if not immediately developed into parks. This practice has resulted in an enviable amount of open space in Red Deer; land acquired at low cost and over a long period of time. This abundance of trees and natural open spaces has attracted many people to that city, including myself, and it has provided many healthy and desirable jobs for the children of the city's residents as parks staff.

One of the overriding planning principles in the preparation of the master plan for this new park was the involvement of the public in the planning process, before final recommendations were made. The planning commission undertook an intensive 4 month phase of public participation, including mail-back questionnaires, the submission of briefs and well-attended public and group meetings. The excellent response provided a clear statement of the public's priorities for the development of the park.

Significantly, the overall support for the acquisition and preservation of sensitive natural areas and the inclusion of the Gaetz Lakes area in the park was virtually unanimous. Briefs submitted by groups such as the Red Deer Naturalists, and numerous private individuals also stressed the importance of acquiring additional lands surrounding the existing sanctuary which in itself, about 1/4 section in size, was considered too small to remain a viable ecological reserve. The public input emphasized that the sanctuary should be linked to a continuous wildlife migration corridor along the river valley. The results of a mail-back questionnaire also provided strong support for the retention of additional natural areas in the Waskasoo Park and for a nature interpretation centre.

The Waskasoo Park Master Plan was completed and unanimously approved by the City and County councils in April of 1982. Public response was, of course, overwhelmingly positive. The public knew what they had asked for and they had ample opportunity to support or argue their positions in open meetings and they had been given ample time, prior to those meetings, to think the issues through and to prepare their presentations. And, they had been listened to. There were no unpleasant surprises for the media to explode and to exploit.

Following the approval of the Master Plan, the City proceeded to acquire those pieces of land that they had not already held. The overall concept proposed a river valley park of approximately 3000 acres, stretching 12 kilometers through the City. The primary emphasis of the plan was the preservation of unique natural areas and the development of a comprehensive system of bicycle and hiking trails, linking the park together. And with the completion of Waskasoo Park, a goodly portion of Red Deer's area is park land and related facilities.

One of the land acquisitions was the Gaetz Lake Sanctuary, itself, which was owned, in part, by the Province. Red Deer River Naturalist society members had long fought to retain the sanctuary status of this particularly valuable portion of the City's natural areas. Various attempts to turn it into a landfill site, a housing development, a private hunting reserve, a freeway and an amusement park, complete with glass embalming bottle castle, had all met with dedicated opposition by our members over the years. The land had been granted federal bird sanctuary status, as long ago as 1923, but totally inappropriate development proposals continually threatened its sanctuary status.

For many years, the people most responsible for the continued existence of this rare, unumbered piece of real natural habitat had been of the impression that the area should be reserved strictly for the wild things of nature - to be a sanctuary, not for the use of people, but for the benefit of plants and birds and other animal life forms which we share the planet with. To many of us, however, there was a reluctant feeling that if the area was not to be totally desecrated by the growth of the City, there had to be a staff to protect it and to guide tours of the curious but cautious into the fringes of the area. We argued that the use of the sanctuary by the school, as a canoe training pond and as a cross country running track, was inappropriate and should be stopped. School classes and the public could be guided through the area, but science collecting trips must not be allowed. An untreed meadow area in private hands, but adjacent to the lakes and woods, needed to be and was purchased to enhance the habitat potential of the whole area, by providing nesting areas, seeds for feed, and insects and mice and gophers to complete the food chain for the predator mammal and bird populations that lived in the inner sanctuary. A staffed nature centre and interpretative centre was located close to the river and acts as a controlled entrance to the sanctuary.

The Gaetz Lake Sanctuary, we argued, was not a recreational area. Instead, it should be looked upon as a sanctuary for birds, plants and animals. It should be viewed as a "gene pool" from which wildlife, particularly birds, could repopulate other areas of the park, as well as the back yards and gardens and boulevards of the City, both for the delight of its citizens and also for the considerable profit of the birdseed growers and merchants, as well as the manufacturers and sellers of bird feeders, binoculars, camera and film, winter clothing, bicycles, cross country ski equipment, outdoor books, etc.

We further asked that a mechanism be established for continuing the dialogue between the urban park planners and the local naturalists so that we could continue to assist in the extremely complex task of trying to provide people with the advantages of access to a natural environment, but in an urban park setting. This

position was accepted by the park planners and the Province. The sanctuary land owned by the Province was sold to the City for the nominal sum of a dollar, but with the following conditions:

- . that the land be used primarily for the protection of wildlife in its natural habitat and that no activity be permitted that conflicted with that objective;
- . that no vehicles be permitted in the area, except in an emergency, and that access and movements in the area be restricted;
- . that no boating, canoeing, camping or picnicking be permitted and to this list, later, was added bicycling;
- . that no horses or pets be allowed in the area.

In addition, the City agreed to establish and maintain a Committee, including a provincial representative, to ensure that the above conditions were complied with. This committee is called the Gaetz Lakes Sanctuary Committee, of which I am a member.

The planning of several other nodes of Waskasoo Park was influenced by the suggestions of local naturalists. One such area was a combined dump and partially abandoned gravel pit. The Mackenzie Trails area was originally conceived as a heavy density picnic area, with uniform depth boating ponds, manicured lawns and bridge-linked islands. Following increased environmental awareness, however, the area retained its picnic area use, but the pond bottoms were sculptured to provide varying water depths so as to provide habitat requirements for a much wider variety of bird life. The islands were no longer linked and their number was increased, so as to provide many nesting opportunities and resultant interesting viewing and educational experiences for the picnickers, who could walk on a trail around much of the pond's perimeter. Much of the area originally planned as lawn was planted to native wildgrass species and is left rank so as to provide feed for deer, mice and birds, which in turn provide free viewing opportunities for the human visitors to the area.

Another area, known as Heritage Ranch, was envisioned, initially, as a site for a golf course or for intensive use recreational playing fields and to be served by a network of roads. However, the planners were finally convinced, by the naturalists, of the value of this area as a place where there was excellent potential for casual and instructive interface between wild creatures and the public. The motorized traffic road was cancelled, to be replaced by horsedrawn vehicles or saddle riding. Bicycle trails were kept away from the fox and coyote denning places and from the heavily used rabbit feeding and bird nesting areas. Narrow walking trails and horse trails were declared off-limits to bikes. The bicycle trails were made to wander in speed-reducing curves and a fine, deep fishing lake was established in which beaver are allowed to proliferate and feed on the abundant scrub

poplar in the area. That area, although close to Highway 2, is quiet, exhaust-fume free and well populated by appreciative walkers, horseback riders, cyclists, picnickers, birdwatchers and cross country skiers and resting river canoeists. The ball diamonds, golf courses and Sunday drivers have all been relocated, and everyone is better off.

Multi-use facilities are too often stretched to extremes for budgetary and political reasons and thus degrade the natural environment, as well as the enjoyment of its human users. Multi-uses must take into consideration the limitations of the natural, as well as the human environment, and should be thoroughly compatible. One too often encounters "natural areas" which in reality have been turned into "unnatural" areas for most users, due to a lack of sufficiently broad based planning knowledge.

Other benefits to the park system and its human and animal inhabitants have resulted from the respectful dialogue which has been established between naturalists, planners and politicians. Trails are now planned so as to avoid going close to large and aging or dead trees. Dead trees are now appreciated as an absolutely essential habitat requirement for many native birds, both in the summer and, even more importantly, in the winter. Stringent measures are in place to protect them from being removed and, where possible, they have been supplemented by man-made substitutes, such as osprey platforms on power poles.

Within our City and park system, the control of mosquitos by chemical means is increasingly being accepted as a fool's game, even by most of the previously vociferous pro-spraying City fathers. The environmental damage and self defeating waste of public money used on insecticide is on its way to being replaced by far less expensive, infinitely safer, and probably more effective means of first understanding the problem and secondly of enhancing naturally existing populations of mosquito predators. This kind of approach is being studied in Red Deer, thanks to the lobbying of environmentalists - who are increasingly listened to in our city. That approach will most certainly have to be copied by other municipalities and parks systems.

The benefits to the enhancement of public pleasure and to an attitude towards the public good in this kind of environmentally responsible exercise can only be contrasted, in my mind, to my own fury and frustration at having my family and myself and a dozen other picnickers drenched in DDT in Edmonton by a low flying plane at a White Mud Creek picnic site in the chemically dark ages of the early 1960s.

In marketing natural areas I believe we can learn much from the experience of those who market museums. Managed natural areas are, after all, just another branch of "museology." This realization has caused the interpretive

nature centre, which controls the entrance to the Gaetz Lake Sanctuary in Red Deer, to be placed under the jurisdiction of the Red Deer and District Museums Board. As a member of that Museums Board, it has been fascinating for me to see the mutually developing appreciation, understanding and help that has grown between those whose interests have lain primarily in studying and understanding human history and its technologies and those who have been primarily interested in natural history and the effect of the interaction of man with his environment. Both groups are interested in attracting and educating a public, but both are faced with a need for finding a balance between interpretive use and protection of the things they want to have viewed, experienced and understood or, as they say, "interpreted".

It's so easy, in both fields, for people to destroy what they have come to see and admire. The marvellous Lascaux Caves in France became so popular that the very chemistry of the air changed as a result of the awestruck breathing of the visitors and was destroying the marvellous formations in the caves. Eventually an underground replica had to be built and, now, tens of thousands of people enter an enormously expensive facsimile facility, so realistic that they don't know they are experiencing a fake. The real caves are sealed and only rarely experienced by anyone. It was necessary to their survival. At Expo the lovely grass turf was replaced every Monday morning to keep it looking fresh and natural. Visitors to the Galapagos Islands must now stay on narrow paths and must all be gone by 6 o'clock. The richness of the wildlife there was bringing admirers in such numbers as to threaten the continued existence of that life. The winter delights of Sunshine Village have become so popular and have been marketed so well that its visitors are, even in present numbers, in danger of destroying the superb and rare high alpine meadow life there. Visitors and security patrols at the Olympics at Mount Allan may well cause the death of its long protected wild mountain sheep herd this winter.

A desire to market a natural resource calls for a careful, and environmentally wide, perspective if the exercise is not to backfire. An experience with nature can be fun and it can be profitable, in many different contexts. Let us hope that those planning the opportunities for people to experience these things will do so in co-operation with local people who have the depth of knowledge and a commitment that could facilitate a much wider vision of the situation and, therefore, an even wiser approach to the solutions sought for in the planning process.

Environmentalists, despite the statements of our Minister of the Environment, are not the enemy. At least not of planners.

Moderator

Thank you Michael

Our fourth and final speaker this morning is Mr. Robin Bovey, a freelance environmental consultant and writer who has been based in Edmonton for the past three years. Prior to that he worked for a number of environmental agencies in the United Kingdom, both in government and non-government sectors. He has a particular interest in the role of the volunteers within the urban environmental conservation movement.

**Mr. Robin Bovey, environmental writer
Edmonton, Alberta**

Thank you Mayor Danchuk.

I was having lunch, yesterday, with a couple of people, one of whom is writing a book about the politics of Western Canada. One of his chapters is going to deal with the land, the environment. Not surprisingly, I guess, I was interested in what he was proposing to write about. He was asking me why there was such a strong tradition, in Western Canada, of interest in the land but, nevertheless, when you compare that to the incredibly strong European tradition of environmental conservation interest, there really wasn't the same sort of interest. And he was asking why. I, perhaps rather frivolously, said that it was because we had messed it all up in Europe, particularly in Britain, and we don't have anything left. So we have realized that we have to go to extreme measures to preserve what's there. He was looking rather worried, and asked me if that was really necessary, and do we really need to mess it all up here in Western Canada. I hope it isn't. But it is frightening when you see the same mistakes being made time and time again. There are so many good blueprints for how you can alleviate problems. I don't believe it is necessary to make the same mistakes and I'm very encouraged with what's happening here. That's why my six month visit to Western Canada three and a half years ago is still going on.

As I have just mentioned, unlike Canada, Britain has no natural areas left - literally no natural areas left that haven't been significantly altered by man. Britain was once largely forested, but even 2000 years ago a large proportion of that forest had disappeared. And since the modern agricultural revolution in Britain, which has taken place since the 1930s, the small area of semi-natural forest that did remain has been halved to its present area of only some 76,000 ha.

This is but one example in a long list of losses and destruction which makes bleak reading and, if anybody's interested, I've brought along a book which was published by the Nature

Conservancy Council, which is the Government body that looks after environmental conservation in Britain.

A present day look at the land use map in Britain shows some 80 percent of the land area is actually taken up with agriculture. And you'll see that the next largest one is urban. There is some 11 percent of the land use area of Britain taken up with urban usage of one sort or another. So the urban area in Britain, is very, very important.

Nature conservation has had to integrate with these land uses and the best sites are protected as national nature reserves. These were all created since the instigation of the Act in 1949 and there are now 200 dotted all over Britain. They cover some 150,000 hectares, still a very small area. They are managed by the Nature Conservancy Council, which is the organization I have just mentioned. All the rest of the organizations that protect land in Britain are non-government organizations, so that the history of non-government organizations in Britain is a very, very strong one, and a very necessary one. The largest of those, the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, has over half a million members.

The most effective protection afforded to important wildlife sites is its designation as a site of special scientific interest. This category of protection was made possible by an Act in 1981 - the Wildlife and Countryside Act. There are over 4000 sites, now, throughout Britain, covering over 1.5 million hectares that are protected under this legislation. Much of that land is actually in private or public ownership, but the owner, nevertheless, must consult the Nature Conservancy Council before carrying out any harmful practices. This powerful legislation is an example of the British public's concern and involvement in the countryside. The Wildlife and Countryside bill that went through Parliament resulted in more mail to Members of Parliament and more Parliamentary Committee time than any other bill before Parliament. This, in turn, was achieved by a really wonderful mobilization of public feeling and public concern by the non-government organizations which eventually resulted in the successful implementation of the legislation.

But what's this got to do with urban wildlife conservation? A great deal, of course. Far too late, we have managed to take steps to ensure the survival of most of the British present-day wildlife and, undoubtedly, there will be more losses in the future but hopefully those will be minimized.

Present-day land uses ensure a huge pressure on wildlife resources and their habitats. Urban areas, particularly residential areas, are becoming increasingly important wildlife areas, particularly for some species, for instance, bats, woodland birds, small mammals and many insects - even inner cities, proving that they

have a role to play in easing the pressure on wildlife. Of equal importance is the role that wildlife plays for people and, I think, this is crucial. For many in these overcrowded urban areas, the city park or the tree lined street or even the house sparrow on a busy street corner is their only contact with the countryside or nature. Just as in Canada, the 55 million people who live in Britain live mostly in urban areas. For these people, the rather formal urban parks are their countryside and, from one month to the next, that may be the only greenery they see. They are used for a wide range of recreational activities - jogging, walking, taking the dog for a walk, kite flying, bird watching. But they were hardly ever envisaged as wildlife areas and, indeed, many are no more than formal gardens. So, what other green areas exist? Railway embankments, old bomb sites, cemeteries, sewage lagoons, it sounds somewhat depressing and many of these sites are prime redevelopment sites anyway.

In Britain, in comes a Thatcher government that has brought austerity and unemployment that make Alberta look somewhat like Shangri-la. The government's policies have killed dead money that might have encouraged urban wildlife projects and, indeed, the latest project of the government is to sell off the 200 national nature reserves to non-government bodies, thereby realizing some more assets and ensuring the Government doesn't have to have that millstone around its neck. It's abolished a lot of the left wing inner city councils which took pride in their social programmes, and unemployment is now well over 3 million. In a nutshell, inner cities in Britain are suffering terrible degradation and degeneration. To use a good English understatement, the situation is potentially somewhat gloomy.

I don't have space to give many examples of how the conservation movement has overcome these problems and, those that I'm going to, are all from central London, for no particularly good reason. I've mentioned city parks and London's are famous - Hyde Park, Regent's Park and Richmond Park. They are all familiar names to residents and visitors alike. But what can be done to ensure their continuing wildlife diversity and, where possible, that that diversity can be improved? They are traditionally managed for public recreation. Dead limbs of trees are neatly trimmed, shrubs pruned, grass cut and borders of flowers planted. However, there have always been sanctuary areas within these parks, away from the ravages of the public gaze.

As the importance of such areas for wildlife became better recognized so did the awareness of the problems and more and more management for wildlife now takes place in the parks. Nest boxes for birds, whether they are birds of prey or ducks, are put up and the reintroduction of native species, wildflowers that once grew in these parts, is now underway.

Many of the woodland birds and wildflower populations have made startling comebacks in recent years, and now all three species of British woodpeckers breed in London. Kestrels, which are a small falcon, have been quick to take advantage of positive encouragements since the 1960s. The small falcons are now a common sight in the parks where they have broken with their country cousins' feeding habits and prey on sparrows and ducklings and even hamburger scraps. In 1890 the naturalist William Hudson thought that they would never see kestrels again in central London. It's nice to know that now they are a really common sight and even occasionally condescend to nest on specially provided nest sites.

Where so many pressures exist on wildlife in the countryside, the value of these urban wildlife areas becomes increasingly obvious. Some of the London reservoirs hold internationally important populations of tufted duck, coots, smew and blackheaded gulls. Even in St. James Park, possibly the finest of London's inner city wildlife areas, truly wild populations of mallard, tufted duck, golden eye and gadwall vie with the ornamental wildfowl for bread and grain fed by visitors to the park.

Much of the praise for the success of these projects has to go the enlightened and enthusiastic management approach, but the general public are also heavily involved. It's they who so often generate the new management, either directly or indirectly, through the many non-government organizations. And perhaps the most effective of these groups is the London Wildlife Trust. Mind you, even they have had their problems, when, in their attempt to reintroduce primroses to Primrose Hill, the bureaucrats of the Greater London Council temporarily refused them permission. However, the success of the non-government groups like this can never be overstated. They usually rely on a shoestring budget but, through their energy and expertise, they've mounted some wonderful projects and this is where the true value of urban wildlife conservation begins to be felt. It's not felt through the grandiose and expensive projects that alienate themselves from the public from the very start. For, urban projects must surely integrate with our everyday lives. It's the projects that evolve from public opinion, that can be brought to the public's awareness and then capture their imagination, that are going to be truly public projects. These projects involve people with their environment, bring people together and give them a positive involvement with their urban surroundings.

Consider a park on the southside of the River Thames in central London, within sight of Tower Bridge, somewhere in the region of one hectare in size. In 1967 it was proposed as a ecology park, whatever that meant, because nobody exactly knew. A small area of natural vegetation would be created and this was a totally new idea in Britain at the time. It

took only a short time to generate enthusiastic public response and, by that autumn, the William Curtis Ecological Park was born, on the understanding that the site would eventually be needed for redevelopment. Plans included a small meadow, a fixed woodland, a pool and even a sand dune. The problem was how to remove the tons of hardcore, import subsoil and grade the site. Simple - use volunteers. They removed the hardcore by hand; subsoil was brought in by advertising a subsoil dump for contractors. They were so grateful that they, in turn, lent machinery to grade the site. Over 150 species of plants were brought in and within 2 years over 350 species were recorded on the site. Frogs were introduced and were spectacularly successful.

A survey of the insects 2 years after the park was opened showed that there were over 200 species present, only 5 of which had been introduced. Perhaps most interestingly, was the colonization of the site by butterflies. By 1984, 21 species had been recorded, 16 regularly in the three preceding years. All this in central London. In the eight years of the park's life, over 100,000 children alone visited the site - their piece of countryside in the heart of London. The success of the William Curtis Park sparked off other initiatives. The London Wildlife Trust now manages a new park, Family Street, near Kings Cross Station, right in the central part of London. Again, only a hectare in size, it was opened in 1985 but has already become the first artificial local nature reserve in Britain, and is booked solid by schools for four years.

These projects were initiated on very small budgets. Some \$4000 saw the William Curtis Park underway and, from its inception, neither it nor any other similar project has had to close through lack of funds, although all of them could certainly do with more cash. There are various other examples of wildlife projects, and I shall mention just a very few of them. London's Victorian cemeteries are a prime example. Take Highgate cemetery, closed in the 1970s. It had, in effect, run out of room by the beginning of this century. The two World Wars had seen the area plunge into neglect and yet it was an exciting jungle of shrubs, trees and leaning gravestones that read like a Victorian who's who. When it closed in the '70s the company had no plans to allow access to visitors but a group was formed - the Friends of Highgate cemetery. Today, it's managed by them with the aim of continuing to allow the public access while maintaining its unique attractions and its wildlife diversity. That's only 5 minutes from central London. The Friends draw together all possible management interests and lobby for funds to carry out necessary works.

The few remaining bomb sites from World War II are now valuable wildlife habitats in their own rights. They are prime habitats for things like Black redstarts, a small bird which is found

virtually nowhere else in Britain. And there are also other derelict sites which are wonderful sites for wildflowers. Some of these include the railway embankments on the many main line services into London's 15 railway mainline stations.

Another important facet of urban conservation has been the sponsorship by industry and commerce. Both of them have shown far more willingness to co-operate in recent years, despite the economic hard times. There are many examples of that to choose from. But at one end of the scale has been the production of educational material, which was made possible by one of the large banks in Britain. Perhaps at the other end of the scale is a very, very successful national campaign to promote local conservationist issues by an oil company.

Now I realize that the British do have a bit of a reputation for being eccentric, something I never realized until I came to Canada. And I guess one has to consider it might be true when you consider a certain Major Coles. His major contribution in recent years has been the introduction of the British Hedgehog Society. He formed this organization in 1982 to provide hedgehog escape ramps in Texas gates, because he was concerned about the number of hedgehogs that were dying after they had fallen in. Now it's trivial in some respects, but little projects like this have created enormous interest and they've captured people's imaginations. And I think that we have to allow ourselves these indulgences and actually involve people in some of the projects that we carry out.

I'd like you to consider another eccentric, Miss Constance Culver of Newcastle-on-Tyne. She was fed up with the untidy back lanes around her house, so she mobilized an army of local volunteers and got professional advice and, in her own words, she "created a sweet-smelling area of growing things, not too attractive to vandals but pleasant for us."

And, I think that's the whole crux of any of our urban environmental projects. This is where we all live and and if the projects are going to be successful and if they are going to actually involve people in the environment, then we have to accept them as being their projects. The project has to grow from the people and people have to be involved right from the start.

Thank you very much.



**Regional
Solid Waste
Management**



REGIONAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT

Moderator: Alderman David Hinch
City of Spruce Grove, Alberta

Ladies and Gentlemen, good morning. My name is David Hinch. I am an alderman in the City of Spruce Grove, the 16th and newest Alberta city.

I'd like to lead you into this morning's session with a story that happened to me this Monday. Like some of us, although not all, we get caught up in our own self-importance. On Monday, I was having coffee with my wife at home and I was showing her my calendar - all of the meetings that I had, the duties, the Commission meetings, the Executive Committee meetings, Council meetings and the various things that go on in the community. I ended up by saying to her that, on top of all that, our Mayor is over in Japan (he's on a mission at the invitation of the Japanese government) and I have to look after all the Committee meetings, all the Council meetings, all the ribbon cutting, all those type of things that are normally his duties, because I'm the Deputy Mayor. So I gave her a "what do you think of that" type of look, and she looked me straight in the eye and said, "Good for you dear, don't forget to take out the garbage."

So she accomplished two things, I suppose. She brought me back to earth and she was practising good solid waste management. And that's the theme of our discussion this morning. We will listen to the speakers and we're presuming that the allotted time of 15 minutes per speaker will take us to the noon break. As was explained by R.G., we'd expect you all back this afternoon to get into the discussions and into the nitty gritty of what is being presented this morning.

So I'll introduce the first speaker, Mr. Joe Kostler.

Mr. Joe Kostler is the head of Waste Management Branch, Pollution Control for Alberta Environment. Joe was born and raised locally and received his secondary and post-secondary education in Edmonton. He received a Bachelor of Science in Chemical Engineering in 1972 at the University of Alberta. In 1980 he obtained a Master's Degree in Environmental Engineering, Department of Civil Engineering, University of Alberta. Employment experience - Joe includes 3 years in private industry from 1972 to 1975 with a petrochemical manufacturer east of Edmonton; in 1975 began employment with Alberta Environment and worked in the Water Quality Control Branch of Pollution Control until 1985. Since then Joe has been the Head of the Waste Management Branch within Pollution Control. Ladies and Gentlemen, Mr. Joe Kostler.

**Mr. Joe Kostler, Branch Head Pollution Control Division,
Alberta Environment, Edmonton, Alberta**

When I look out at this small group here, I reflect back to the session that we had yesterday. We had close to some 400 people and we presented a fairly technical programme. Gilbert commented that perhaps it was a little bit too technical, so I looked at the paper I am going to give today. I don't think it is all that technical, and yet when I look at the audience, I think the group that is here is probably more in tune with the topic than the people who were at the programme yesterday.

In preparing for the 1988 Winter Seminar, I looked at the Province's role in dealing with what is viewed as mainly a municipal concern and if there is, or should be, a role for the regional planning commission. In addressing that particular concern, I briefly reviewed one of Alberta Environment's programmes dealing with regional waste management assistance. I would like to highlight some of our observations and experiences from that programme and relate that to the roles that perhaps the regional planning commissions can play.

Alberta Environment's involvement began in 1975-1976 with the introduction of a Regional Waste Management Assistance Programme. Qualified participants (i.e., two or more urban municipalities and all or part of a surrounding municipality) were eligible for grant funding for capital equipment or components in the regional waste management system. This would include the landfill site, transfer stations, transfer trailers, etc. Today, we have about twenty operational regional systems that have resulted in the closure of some 150 dump sites.

The objective of the programme was to provide Albertans with environmentally sound and secure sanitary landfills which represent a responsible solution to handling the municipal solid wastes that we generate.

In 1988, we are about halfway through the programme. We have spent nearly \$20 million in capital grants. In looking at the programme and reflecting on it, we see some common elements that surface in successfully launching and completing a regional system. There is no doubt that the "Nimby" Syndrome (not in my backyard) surfaces at the start of many projects. As the Nimby Syndrome surfaces, there is an immediate negative connotation associated with the anticipated programme. And unless that is dealt with immediately, the project can run into a rough or impossible launch.

The first important point to recognize is that these systems are designed by the regional

authorities for their use and continued operation. That is a very important point to recognize. No regional system is ever forced on anyone. The regional systems are considered to be an alternative that is available to address a common concern in an area called municipal solid waste management.

Before continuing, I would be remiss in discussing Nimby, if reference were not made to the successful siting of the Alberta Special Waste Treatment Centre near Swan Hills. Albertans can be proud of the thorough and detailed siting process that was used in locating the center. Not only were technical considerations important, but the acceptance of the project in the siting area was also paramount. This Alberta success is a model for other Canadians and North Americans to study as they try to implement various solutions to their waste management problem.

Throughout any siting process, education/awareness and active participant involvement are two key critical factors that will lead to a successful system.

In the area of education/awareness, several items or questions have been identified and must be addressed right up front:

- (1) Why is there a need for a new solid waste management system? Are you satisfied with the dump that we have in the back quarter, and paying a dollar a year?
- (2) What alternatives or options, including resource recovery, are available? Is a landfill always the solution we have to go to? Are there other options?
- (3) What are the social, economic, and environmental impacts of such a system and the way it is going to be operated?
- (4) What are the associated costs?
- (5) What are other jurisdictions doing? Have they been successful? Can we translate that experience to our situation?
- (6) Where will the system be located? What considerations were reviewed in making the selection? Has it, in fact, already been made? What is the process that is going to be used to make that selection?
- (7) How are operational concerns going to be addressed, for example, the handling of special wastes, recyclable materials?
- (8) What type of ongoing dialogue is going to be established with the people who are going to use the system and the people who are building the system?

The second area that we look at is the active participant involvement:

- (1) In the regional systems where we have been involved, a siting committee normally involves community leaders and members and technical support people. The community participants are those stakeholders that will be involved in selecting the system and operating the system.
- (2) Communications throughout the whole process are very important. Information provided by regional authorities is a lot more credible when it comes from them, than if the technical people, the people from our Branch, or other people that are involved, come out and talk to the people that are going to be using it.
- (3) The actual siting process may involve a technique that uses constraint mapping. We have found that one to be very successful, and, hopefully, that kind of a process will lead to more than one solution being available, so we don't focus in on one specific site, which gives people no choice.
- (4) The final decision on the site selection really rests with the regional authority members. Alberta Environment, Community and Occupational Health or the public health inspector don't come in and say this is where you have to site it.
- (5) Decisions on all aspects of the system, including transfer station locations and other major components, rest with the regional authority.

Through this active participation, the solution and system to handle the municipal solid wastes in the area, is up to the authority, its members and the residents or users in that area, all of which are represented through the authority.

This is where regional planning commissions, such as the EMRPC, can play an active role. They are an integral part of the entire region and are involved in many decisions that are, in effect, planning.

When I sat down and started preparing for this, I had some literature that was given to me. I looked at the new logo that the EMRPC has, and it was interesting to note how they had symbolized five components in this logo. The five modules symbolized the commission's boundary, the jurisdictions by area and the five types of municipalities that are represented. I took a look at it and looked at our regional programme and, if I looked at one module I could see the Sturgeon system in place; in another module the Leduc system. The Strathfort and/or the Edmonton-Strathfort regional system can be identified and perhaps, in the future, the County of Parkland will be included as a module.

When we looked at the mandate of the EMPRC, it focuses on planning for orderly development in the Edmonton Metropolitan Region. It was interesting to note in the literature that all the positive things in planning came out. Work involving parks, recreation facilities, schools, subdivisions, buildings, urbanization and orderly industrial development. As mentioned earlier, if the negative connotation of dealing with our municipal solid waste can be turned around and handled in a positive note, then perhaps we will see this aspect listed in these planning highlights. It should be. This is the challenge facing you today.

Components of your Commission, such as the Strategic Planning Branch, have the opportunity to recognize and incorporate the need for solid waste handling systems and factor them into the overall plans they are developing right now. They have the opportunity to look down the road, see how development will take place, and see how these needs can be adequately addressed through the Commission.

As I noted earlier, active participation and education and awareness are critical factors in a successful siting process, and this applies to landfills, transfer stations, recycling facilities, incinerators, etc. Through the planning process, the Commission will be able to initiate and recognize these needs very early in the process. They can involve the Commission membership and those people it serves. If the regional plans have addressed this early in any regional plan development, it will be easier for people wishing to establish these facilities down the road. Certainly, siting is not getting easier, but with planning and future recognition given to those eventual needs, hopefully, it will not get any more difficult.

Just recently, the City of Edmonton placed ads in the Edmonton newspapers, soliciting input for potential solutions to the imminent problems it is facing in handling its municipal solid wastes. The EMRPC may have already taken up the challenge to help the City arrive at a solution. Given the short time frame involved here, and the longer time frame required to develop sound regional plans, it may be difficult to provide a significant input into the City's required solution for today, or next year.

But, now is the time to begin planning for the solution to handling our municipal solid wastes twenty-five years down the road. You don't know what that system is going to be but you still have to put that into your planning horizons right now. With this planning work done, the issue we face today, with siting location, hopefully need not surface again. You will be planning for the future and the recognition for solid waste handling, through whatever system you use, is something that should be planned.

So, when I go back to the original question,

that was put to me, of whether or not there is a role for regional planning commissions in planning for solid waste systems - the short answer is "yes" and the time to do it is "now".

Thank you very much.

Moderator

Thank you Joe. Just a reminder of the session theme - how regional is regional solid waste management in Alberta, today? How can or should the Edmonton Metropolitan Regional Planning Commission be involved in the decision-making, or is another participating agency in an already difficult process simply an unnecessary complication? I guess this can apply to any regional planning commission. If not the Commissions then who should have the responsibility for the management of solid waste in the metropolitan areas? So if you just keep those in mind, I'll introduce the next speaker, Mr. Gilbert Boddez.

Gilbert was born and raised in the Greater Edmonton Area. Mr. Boddez began his career in the banking industry, after which he accepted a temporary position as a clerk with the Municipal District of Sturgeon. That was twenty-six years ago. He has since moved through the administrative ranks of the M.D. to his present position of administrator. Mr. Boddez also completed the University of Alberta's Extension Program leading to a Certificate in Local Government Administration. He is an active member of the community and has just recently been elected to the position of Zone 3 Director of the Rural Municipal Administrators Association of Alberta. Ladies and Gentlemen, Mr. Boddez.

**Mr. Gilbert Boddez, Municipal Administrator
Municipal District of Sturgeon, Alberta**

Thank you Mr. Moderator, fellow panellists, Ladies and Gentlemen.

I would like to thank the Edmonton Metropolitan Regional Planning Commission for allowing me the opportunity to discuss our Regional Sanitary Landfill operation with you. Sometimes, talking about garbage can be a boring subject, but I have the advantage standing up here, so if you will bear with me for the next few minutes, I will tell you about our sanitary landfill operation within the M.D. of Sturgeon and the reasons for how and why we got into a Regional System.

I'd like to give you a little history about our area and the garbage process, which I'm sure wasn't unlike many other areas in the Province. Years back, every town (five) within our municipality operated their own dump. In addition to those, there were a few extra sites scattered around the country-side, also being used as dumps. One site that was probably the most popular was the old "Cardiff Dump". This site was located south-east of the Town of Morinville, in an abandoned coal mining area. The M.D. of Sturgeon was attempting to reclaim some of the waste land by filling these depressions with garbage, and we thought this

was an excellent idea. The sink hole we were using was between 40'-50' deep and covered an area of approximately two to three acres. So all we had to do was push the garbage over the edge and add a cover as a final step. A very economical process! There was only one problem - the hole was filled with water which concerned our friends at Alberta Environment, who subsequently convinced us to close the site and operate what they considered a proper regional site. Operating our present site is considerably more expensive, because we now have to dig the pits and refill them with the garbage. The "Old Cardiff Dump" was renowned for its "merchandise exchange." The site was open seven days a week, 24 hours a day. The municipality operated the site with one old, worn-out D7 push cat, and the operator only worked about two hours a day because 75% of the garbage brought into the site was recycled by other people taking it back home. The 25% that remained was normally set on fire by some disgruntled shopper who thought, "if it isn't good enough for me, it wasn't good enough for anybody else." Consequently, when it came time to push the garbage over the edge, there wasn't much there, so the old site should have lasted for a good many years with very little expense.

Well, in the late 1970s and early 1980s there was a tremendous change in Provincial Government regulations, enforcement and funding of solid waste disposal systems. Alberta Environment set out to close the local community dumps and assisted municipalities in organizing regional sanitary landfills.

In February, 1980, the Municipal District of Sturgeon, along with the Towns of Morinville, Gibbons, Bon Accord, Redwater and the Village of Legal entered into an agreement, which formed the Sturgeon Regional Sanitary Landfill Authority. Each participating municipality, at its annual organizational meeting, appoints one of its members and an alternate as a member of the Authority. The Authority then elects a Chairman, Vice Chairman, Secretary-Treasurer, etc., and has meetings, when necessary, at the call of the Chairman. We normally have nine to ten meetings per year.

The Sanitary Landfill Authority has full control and the power to hire personnel for the construction, maintenance and operation of regional solid waste. The Authority can enter into contracts with any person, corporation or municipality, for the provision of any service or commodity necessary for the efficient operation of the system.

Alberta Environment were very supportive of regionalizing landfills, to the point where they purchased the 120 acre site (for which we have a long-term lease), paid for the initial construction, the leachate system installation, and also contributed toward capital costs. Those were the good old days, when our Government seemed to be made of money. I think the rules of the game have changed considerably

since then.

Now, for the first two years, the Sanitary Landfill Authority paid the Municipal District of Sturgeon to operate the site. The Authority purchased its own compactor and the M.D. provided the necessary track equipment and rubber tired earth movers to haul in the cover material that was required. The municipality charged the Authority government rates for the equipment for the hours that were worked. This process was an excellent learning experience for the Board and also for myself, as the Secretary-Treasurer. It was also a heck of a lot of work!

So when the opportunity became available to contract out the operation, the Authority signed the agreement with pleasure. That was in 1982 and the contractor was Maplethorpe Contracting, who is still our contractor today.

Costwise, contracting versus owner operator, the costs are probably close to equal, or contracting at this time could be a little cheaper, but I'll tell you one thing, I haven't taken a Tylenol since we signed the contract. I failed to mention that we have a weigh scale at the site and all refuse is weighed, basically for statistical purposes, for both the sanitary landfill and for Alberta Environment. Alberta Environment insisted the scale be installed and operated, and since they paid for it, it didn't leave much room for argument. Operating the weigh scale creates an added cost to the operation and maintenance budget, but I guess it does create employment, which is a good point. We also maintain a separate storage area at the site for empty chemical containers. This is very popular with our farming community, because contaminated containers can be very hazardous if left lying around the farm yard. We have also installed a 3000 gallon underground tank for the collection of used oil, so as you can see, we are attempting to help as many people as possible get rid of their refuse.

Just a brief note on our budget. We operate on a budget of approximately \$160,000.00 per year and cover approximately 17-18,000 tonnes of garbage. We operate on a requisition basis, based on a per capita cost, which was \$6.28 per capita for 1987. We service a population area of approximately 26,000 people.

The Municipal District of Sturgeon and the Town of Redwater, in a joint venture, also operate a transfer station, which is located approximately 33 miles from our main sanitary landfill site. The operation and hauling from the transfer station to our major site is contracted out and costs both the Town and the M.D. \$1200.00 each per month.

Given normal growth, with no surprises (and maybe I should check with R.G. to make sure we're not missing something) our site will give us at least another 20 years of use. Now, I

know Lawrence Decore would, probably, give his eye teeth to be in our position, but from what I read and hear, he's having a little trouble accomplishing that. I wish him well.

There is one other area I would like to briefly touch on, and that is locating the site. It is imperative that proper testing of any proposed sanitary landfill site be done before final purchase agreements are signed. If at all possible, the site should be free from underground water. Underground water can be very expensive to control. We are compelled to operate a leachate system that requires daily pumping. We are very fortunate to have the Morinville Sewage Lagoon adjacent to our landfill site. We have permission to pump our leachate directly into their sewage system. It is very time-consuming and gets expensive when motors and pumps need replacing. Alberta Environment monitors the system on a regular basis, which is an extra cost to them, so if at all possible I would suggest a high and dry site can save you a lot of time and expense over the long run (or even the short run).

I think I have almost overrun my time allotment Mr. Chairman so I would once again like to thank you for giving me the opportunity to discuss our Regional Sanitary Landfill system with you.

Thank you.

Moderator

Our next speaker is Mr. Len Hayten, an Administrator, with the Solid Waste Division of the Greater Vancouver Regional District.

Mr. Hayten holds a Bachelor of Applied Science Degree in Civil Engineering from the University of British Columbia. He has 20 years experience in the fields of sewage collection and treatment and water supply. He has been employed by the Greater Vancouver Regional District Solid Waste Division for 7 years. He currently holds the position of Administrator of Solid Waste Division. Len.

**Mr. Len Hayten, Solid Waste Disposal Branch
Greater Vancouver Regional District, British Columbia**

Thank you Mr. Chairman. Ladies and Gentlemen

It's a pleasure to be here to tell you about our experiences. I can tell you that the experience in the GVRD hasn't always been a successful one. However, after many years of wrestling with the problem of waste disposal, the Region was faced with a very critical situation in early 1985 and was able to put together a waste management plan. I am going to speak to you about some of things that we did that we did wrong, and, in the end, some of the things that we did that we did right. I'm going to give you an overview of our plan, what the plan achieves and the cost of that plan.

A satellite photograph of the Greater Vancouver area shows there is not a lot of opportunity for landfilling, with a rather mountainous region to the north, and other upland areas. The Fraser River Delta has been the home of most of the Region's landfills, on the low lying areas. Historically, every municipality and City in the Greater Vancouver area had its own landfill and took care of its own waste disposal problem. And that sufficed until the mid-sixties. The first significant movement made, then, was that the City of Vancouver, with a population of roughly 450,000, simply ran out of landfill space. They moved to a bog site in the Municipality of Delta and were fortunate enough to buy 1000 acres of land. They established a waste disposal site there in 1966.

The rest of the Region was also having its difficulties. Five of the various municipalities were relying on a site in the District of Coquitlam. I should just mention, here, that the GVRD came into existence in 1968. However, prior to that, since 1913, there was an organization that offered regional services - the Greater Vancouver Sewage and Drainage District. The Sewage and Drainage District, as the name implies, dealt with liquid

waste disposal. Solid waste wasn't a function of the district. But by the late '60s, early '70s, the success of the Regional District and the other districts in providing regional services, e.g. the Greater Vancouver Water District, led the politicians to the notion that the regional district function should be expanded to include the disposal of solid waste.

The first move, in that regard, was a study by a Board of Engineers. This was a significant element in this whole thing. The Board of Engineers, which included representatives from the City of Vancouver, the Regional District and a prominent consultant engineering firm, came to a simple conclusion. They supported the idea that waste disposal should be a regional function; that it would be less costly done on a regional basis than individually; and further, for the foreseeable future, landfilling should be the method of waste disposal. In 1973, their report stated that while landfilling should be the approach taken, it should be recognized that other disposal options may arise. Following that, all the machinery was put in place; the letters patent for the Region to undertake this new function were enacted; and, in response to a crisis in 1974, (a private operator announced that he was going to close his site) we inherited 5 municipalities in immediate need of waste disposal.

With that problem, we established a site in 1974 in Coquitlam. The Coquitlam site was prime industrial land, it was a bog site, and we intended to stay there for approximately 4 years, after which we would move on. We would basically floodproof the site and use it as industrial land. Well, we made a number of errors. Firstly, it was adjacent to the Trans Canada Highway. It was a good site from an access point of view. A lot of garbage flooded into the region because the tipping fee, the cost of doing business, was around \$4.50 a ton at the time. So we got more waste than we should have, and filled the site more quickly. In the meantime, we said, "Well we are going to have to replace it, but we still have the philosophy that all we'll ever have to do, here, is landfill our garbage." We said, "Well, this is a 10,000 acre peat bog," and our first reaction was that we should buy some land and start a new landfill in the north-east corner of this bog. There was a new highway coming across which would serve that dense area of the City quite well. The host municipality took the position that they did not wish to be the dumping ground of the Lower Mainland. They already had the Burns Bog site and they accepted that Vancouver, Richmond, Delta and White Rock in the south, could all have access to that site, but no one else. That was a pinnacle decision and our Board accepted that.

The Board of Engineers report called for two landfills. There was a landfill already at Port Mann and on a bend in the river, we thought we had found another good site. It was very

similar to the Port Mann landfill site, so we promptly went out and purchased it. Then we looked at the land to see what we had really purchased. We found out that there was a creek through it, which environmentalists claimed had all sorts of unique flora and fauna. We hired some consultants and they confirmed that 2/3 of the flora and fauna of the province were represented on that little site. There was a small airport across the river and it came within the envelope of the Transport Canada Regulations. As well, the province told us that it was valuable floodway in the freshets on the Fraser River and they wouldn't want to see that filled with garbage. Needless to say that site expired.

By this time, a lot of controversy was arising in the Greater Vancouver area on the direction we should really take. Our Board said, "surely you can do something else, besides landfill this garbage." So they commissioned a great number of studies. Most of these were internal studies. We had a small design staff, or design team, that really put their backs to the wheel. They sent these people to Europe; members of the Board also went to Europe. And we tried to deal with the notion of whether we really needed another landfill. And the result of course, was that we needed another landfill. But, because of these problems, I think the first real significant development was made.

In 1981, we changed the stance from simply landfilling and the Board adopted, what we refer to, as a 5 part programme. That was a real milestone in the Region's thinking because prior to that we were simply looking at landfills as solutions. In October of 1981, the Board took the position that we should have landfills and we should have transfer stations to reduce the amount of traffic going to landfills. This was held to be one of the other big concerns. If you have a transfer station you can reduce the traffic, so transfer stations were accepted as a concept. Also, we accepted that there should be some waste reduction through incineration with energy recovery and, as well of course, the concept of recycling. Community recycling. Recycling in any form that we could bring it about. So, basically, we have two landfills, transfer station concept, energy recovery with incineration, and recycling.

We managed to proceed on all of these, with some success. Appreciate that we still only have Burns Bog, as one site was due to close in '88, and another did, in fact, close in '83. So we went outside of our region into Langley, to a mined peat bog site. We said we would have transfer stations so we won't have all the traffic coming into the municipality. We offered the municipality free waste disposal. We offered to develop an 18 hole golf course on the landfill. As well, we recognized that the municipality was in difficulty with its liquid waste disposal, and we were willing to talk about accommodating them, with respect to the

disposal of liquid waste. Anyhow, we were met at the local community hall on the hearings about the site by a great delegation, a very well organized group, the Langley Historic Society. And, basically, we made the decision to cut and run. They had made their argument that there was a park nearby on the foreshore. In fact, right around the foreshore there was a park which the Regional District, itself, operates. In fact, we even had Regional District people opposing it.

Failing that initiative, and that was in late 1981, we girded ourselves and went north of the river, to a place known as Pit Polder. However it, too, had a down side. We had various people offering us land, and several parcels of land were available there, each in the order of a 1000 acres. But Ducks Unlimited had put 1/2 million dollars of improvements in the bog lands to the north of the drained Polder area. I'll tell you one thing about waste disposal. If you ever cut and run, at your second chance at the bat, you don't have as good an opportunity as the first time. They had an even smaller municipal haul-out and, if you can believe it, there was a delegation of 500 angry people when we arrived there in the spring of '82.

All of these areas were outside the boundaries of the sewage and drainage district. Quite frankly, we didn't have the divine power to expropriate. More importantly than that, our Board was not of a mind to impose a landfill on a community that didn't want it. Communities like that make a simple argument. They say, it is not our garbage, it is not our problem. There is, of course, a pretty good counter-argument to that. We all live in an integrated community in a large sense and there are certain services and benefits. For example, the Metropolitan Vancouver area provides benefits to people in the outlying areas. They use our hospitals for specialized services; when they fly off to Hawaii, as we reminded them, the airplane they take off in out of the Vancouver area leaves a trail of spent hydrocarbons over Richmond. We do live in an integrated community and sometimes you do have to be prepared to counter these arguments.

In any event, our Board wasn't of a mind to pursue those issues. So, we were really getting backed into a corner. This is 1982. We were intending to be out of the Coquitlam landfill in 1978. We had been there twice as long as we should have been. We now had a small ski slope. We had really sterilized the land in terms of industrial development. The amount of waste we had put into it had removed 90 acres, of otherwise prime industrial land, that the host municipality is not collecting any taxes on. So there were a number of down sides.

In the meantime, we proceeded with the other parts of our five part programme. We went back to Burns Bog, because part of that five part programme was to expand the westerly landfill and establish an eastern one. We had to get out

of Coquitlam; we could buy land adjacent to the City of Vancouver site. We purchased 560 acres adjacent to that site, did the geotechnical studies, with the intention of establishing a temporary landfill until we could get our eastern site. By that time, certain common sense started to prevail. Vancouver, who owned the Burns Bog site and the host municipality said, we'll accommodate you for 3 years in exchange for a guarantee that the Region will never establish another municipal landfill in the Bog. At the same time, the other Regional Districts, Central Fraser Valley and Dewdney-Alouette, were also having difficulties and the Ministry of Environment for the Province sponsored an interregional (the GVRD, Central Fraser Valley, Dewdney-Alouette) study for the whole Lower Mainland. We felt that, with this provincial sponsorship, the process would give us the landfill that we had been seeking. So we opted into the plan, as did the other Regional Districts. We had 3 years, basically, to come up with a solution and put a solution in place. We only had 3 years tenure at Burns Bog; incidentally, that tenure allowed us to close the Coquitlam landfill, finally, in 1983. The garbage was transferred in bulk from a temporary station into the Bog.

We were now not looking at a landfill; we were now talking about establishing a waste management plan. In 1983, the Province had introduced a new Waste Management Act that advocated the establishment of regional plans for waste disposal and waste management. A significant part of that process was the public information program. Under this Lower Mainland Refuse Project, which was the title of the study headed by Mr. Keith Henry, there were many open houses and public information programmes up and down the valley. One thing became very clear. When we were at open houses and workshops in the Vancouver area, you could talk about a landfill and everyone thought it was a great thing. There wasn't any fear, whatsoever, that there would be a landfill in the urbanized areas. When we got out to Langley, they decided this isn't a good idea at all. What you should really be doing is burning your garbage. There is no need to have a landfill. You can recycle it or you can burn.

The net result of all this was that the project manager actually advocated a program whereby Burns Bog would remain as the long-term landfill of the Region. There are 1500 odd acres there now committed to landfill, of which only 200 have been filled to date. The idea was to establish a landfill to take municipal wastes from other parts of the region and, over a 10 year period, build 9 incinerators so that all of the municipal garbage would be incinerated and, ultimately, this landfill and the one in the east would only receive incinerator ash. That proposal died for two reasons. Firstly, it had a present worth value of 900 million dollars. Secondly, having been fresh from the wars of attempting to site a landfill, we didn't think

it would be that easy to site 9 incinerators, because some of the people we had talked to had made it pretty plain that they didn't think incinerators were a great idea either. So that proposal died. Another reason it died, quite frankly, is that one of the key mandates of the Lower Mainland Refuse Project was that it was to be non-political. Anyhow, when the idea of a 10 year landfill was announced, the member for the legislature announced his total opposition to locating it in his municipality.

You can appreciate the dilemma we were then faced with. We had made a commitment to Vancouver and Delta that we were getting out in 3 years. One and 1/2 years had passed in the Lower Mainland Refuse Project initiative and we didn't have anything. We could see that it was going to flounder on the shoals. That's really the history and background of where we were coming from.

The 4 prerequisites that we had were: necessity; political commitment; a decision-making vehicle; and, alternatives and cost. Without any of those ingredients, we could not have put together our plan. The political people were absolutely fed up as we had chased this thing long enough without any answers and, now, we were backed into a corner. The decision-making vehicle, as it turned out, was a special committee of the Board, as well as senior staff, to look at various options.

The principle of our plan is summarized in four points: waste reduction; traffic reduction; improved operating standards for landfills; and, establishment of high environmental standards in any new facilities, particularly our refuse incineration plant. We started the process in April of '85. And by December of '85 the Minister of Environment had approved the plan. It involves a transfer station in Vancouver; a resource recovery plant in Vancouver; a transfer station on the North Shore; a resource recovery plant that will produce refuse derived fuels; expansion of the eastern landfill for about 10 years; a 210,000 tonne a year incineration plant; and, of course, the expansion of Burns Bog. The plan also recognizes, ultimately, that the landfill is only a 10 year site and that we would need another landfill. We have managed to get a remote site, some 200 miles outside Vancouver, and we are just about to conclude contracts and agreements to put all that in place.

I'd like to give you just a quick idea of what such a plan achieves. Without the plan, all of our garbage is going to landfill. With it, we will only have 55 percent going to landfill, that is a 45 percent removal. The top 10% reduction we expect to take place through the community recycling programmes, the other 13 percent through the resource recovery plants; and 22 percent through the incinerator. By the end of 1989 we will have achieved about 35 percent of that waste reduction and the other 10 percent will follow over another 3 to 4 year

period. Incidentally, that level of waste reduction places Greater Vancouver midway between West Germany and the Netherlands. It far exceeds any urban community in Canada, but it has a price tag.

Some of the programmes that we are looking at as part of our waste plan, include an aggressive recycling programme, and a schools' programme. Last year we gave presentations to about 15,000 school children to get them involved in recycling.

In summarizing, I'll just say that, with respect to our incinerator, it is the type of facility that no single community could build. You can only get involved in this type of program as part of a regional system. It just wouldn't be practical for a single community to attempt to undertake the capital debt to operate and to manage this facility. Thank you.

Moderator

Our final speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, is Mr. Ted Rattray. He's a president of Wastech Services Ltd., Vancouver, B.C. Mr. Rattray has a Bachelor's Degree in Chemical Engineering from McGill University and a Master's Degree in Environmental Engineering, University of Western Ontario. He is currently President and chief operating officer of Wastech Services Ltd., where he is responsible for the company's general management and business development. In 1986 Wastech Services Ltd. and an affiliated U.S. corporation, Wastech Incorporated, purchased the Solid Waste Management businesses of GSX Corporation, formerly a Genstar subsidiary, in British Columbia and Oregon. Mr. Rattray was for several years a regional vice president with Genstar, responsible for the management of the company's business in Western Canada and the Pacific Northwest U.S.A. Prior to joining Genstar in 1979, Mr. Rattray was a director of the Federal Government's Office of Solid Waste Management.

(We regret that because of problems with the recording equipment, we are unable to reproduce Mr. Rattray's presentation.)

**Plenary Session Workshop
Reports**



PLENARY SESSION—WORKSHOP REPORTS

Moderator: Mayor Ross G. Quinn, Chairman
Edmonton Metropolitan Regional Planning Commission

The moderator for the session on Solid Waste Management was Alderman David Hinch, City of Spruce Grove and Dave is going to be the speaker. Preserving Natural Areas for Fun and Profit was moderated by Mayor Lee Danchuk, Mayor of Bon Accord, and he will be the presenter. For Regional Airport Authorities, the moderator was Councillor Albert Klapstein, County of Leduc and the option that he chose is to delegate. He has Ron Pollock from the County of Parkland doing the presentation.

If we could start, then, with Alderman Dave Hinch.

Alderman David Hinch, City of Spruce Grove, Alberta

Thank you Ross. We had four speakers on our panel and I'll, just briefly, give you an abstract of what their comments were to our session.

The first speaker was Mr. Joe Kostler, Head of Waste Management Branch, Pollution Control, Alberta Environment. Alberta Environment is in the 12th year of its regional waste management assistance program. The program provides capital grant funding for the establishment of environmentally sound sanitary landfills. Twenty regional systems have been successfully established and represent approximately 1/2 of the envisaged programme. The concept of a regional system was suggested in that the groups represented have a common interest, such as dealing with their municipal solid waste. In fact, the qualifications for the programme require the participation of 2 or more urban municipalities and the surrounding municipality. From this, there is a rough analogy that can be related to the regional planning commissions established throughout the province. It is suggested that there is indeed a role that the regional planning commissions can play for those regional waste management systems yet to be built, and, in the longer term, for those that will be renewing their systems in the next 20 to 25 years. Joe's concluding remarks expressed the need for future planning, at this time, right now.

The second speaker was Mr. Gilbert Boddez, Municipal Administrator, M.D. of Sturgeon, and Mr. Boddez discussed the Sturgeon Sanitary Landfill Authority, its membership, how it was formed and how it functions. From the Commission's perspective, this is a discussion of subregional solid waste management, although under the provincial programme, it qualifies as a regional system. Major improvements have been

made, in co-operation with the jurisdictions throughout this particular facility, and it was discussed whether or not this could be improved upon.

The third speaker was Mr. Len Hayten, Administrator, Solid Waste Division, Greater Vancouver Regional District. Mr. Hayten addressed the GVRD's experience in establishing a solid waste management plan. He described the plan, itself, as well as the costs stemming from implementation of the plan. He discussed public acceptability of the plan, and the need for the larger region to support, for example, the cost. One municipality could not support it by itself.

Mr. Ted Rattray is President of Wastech Services Ltd. Mr. Rattray dealt with solid waste management, from a business perspective, reviewing solutions to solid waste problems from throughout Western Canada and the American North-west. Ted spoke of alternatives, of multi-systems approaches, landfill sites plus resource recovery and the need, from his perspective, for the planning to be done in concert. More than one system should be planned at the same time.

Now to the discussion that we had later in the afternoon, bearing in mind the theme of our seminar, Regional Issues - Where do we fit in? We're able to report a very lively discussion. There's nothing like garbage to get you going, I guess. It's very topical.

Several major themes emerged and I might say re-occurred throughout the group discussion. These are:

- (1) The big town versus a small town and rural settings in terms of the solutions to solve solid waste problems.
- (2) Public acceptability.
- (3) A nightmarish approval process.
- (4) Costs

Getting back to Number 1 - the big town versus small town, and rural differences. The system of solid waste management, described by Mr. Hayten for the Greater Vancouver Regional District, involved recycling, incineration, resource recovery - in short a multi-faceted approach. It is clearly only possible in a large metro setting, with many municipalities and entities participating. Our delegates, from some of the more remote areas of the province, rightly cautioned that solutions to the Edmonton Metro problem may not be appropriate as a provincial standard to their situation.

Regarding public acceptability, this is a problem

that is not unfamiliar to us in the Edmonton Metro Area. Some of our speakers were likewise faced with similar problems. The approaches suggested for dealing with this - notice, I didn't use the word "solutions" - the approaches suggested included significant emphasis on prior communication, consultation and education involving local citizens and local officials directly. It was suggested that one means of succeeding in the sanitary landfill site selection process, in other words "combating public opposition", is to develop a multi-faceted approval approach where total reliance is not placed only on a landfill. Actual touring of facilities, sensitive to social and environmental concerns, is a valuable educational tool.

The third item was in regards to the nightmarish approval process. It seems this has been experienced firsthand by many of the delegates. Let me say, we did not let our environmental expert from Alberta Environment off the hook very easily. It is acknowledged that administrative and bureaucratic problems of many sorts complicate the process. Not the least of these is the large number of participating agencies and offices that you have to go through to get your final approval.

With regard to cost, there is no doubt that the cost of a comprehensive solid waste management program will be higher than the landfill costs we have been accustomed to. There are two arguments. One is that when the sites are available and properly engineered you are spending taxpayers' money irresponsibly by opting for a \$40 per tonne solution when a \$10 solution will do. The other is that ultimately we will need the more comprehensive solution and this will inevitably include landfill. In order to get the landfill site in 20 years, you need that comprehensive plan with more options.

Conclusions

How do we tie in to the regional involvement in the solid waste management process? Recognizing that the solutions are not all equally appropriate for all areas, there seemed to be a consensus that a community of users could better address the solid waste issue, than individual users. The regional planning commission could perhaps play a worthwhile role in streamlining or co-ordinating the site selection approval process. The Commission may, perhaps, be a facilitator in some instances. Finally, an integrated, comprehensive, forward-looking system must be planned for now, and must be contemplated on a regional basis to be feasible.

Mr. Chairman that's the summary of our session this afternoon.

Moderator

Thank you very much Dave. Now we'll have the moderator of Preserving Natural Areas for Fun And Profit - Mayor Lee Danchuk from Bon Accord.

Mayor Len Danchuk, Town of Bon Accord, Alberta

Thank you Ross. We had four speakers at our session, as well. Our first speaker, Mr. Gerald McKeating, is a Programme Head from Habitat Conservation for Western Canada, for the Canadian Wildlife Service. His abstract, basically, indicated that interest in nature and participation in associated activities have significantly increased over the past decade. This interest can be demonstrated by surveys undertaken by Stats Canada. Urban environments provide opportunities for the enjoyment and enhancement of nature, but usually we view them only in terms of protecting natural areas. Urban areas can be viewed as a continuum of wildlife habitats, ecologically rich and, with some planning or political foresight, can provide aesthetic diversity and recreational opportunities at a minimum cost to the taxpayer.

Our second speaker was Mr. Bill Elliot, the Executive Director for the Fort Whyte Centre, located just outside Winnipeg, Manitoba. This is a privately operated, non-profit project of the Wildlife Foundation in Manitoba. Basically, Mr. Elliot went over how they operate with 7 full-time and 4 part-time staff and 80 volunteers and a budget of approximately \$284,000 a year. Revenue sources include admissions and programme fees, membership dues, retail net, donations, endowment funds interest, and public and private sector grants. A very small portion is government funded.

Our third speaker was Mr. Michael O'Brien of the Gaetz Lakes Sanctuary Committee of Red Deer. Mr. O'Brien outlined the operation of the Gaetz Lakes Sanctuary, how it came into being and some of the funding. The opening of the new facilities, although restrictive, will allow easy access to many environmentally sensitive areas. The continuing management and protection of this unique resource is a real challenge to parks staff, the Museum Board, the Gaetz Lake Sanctuary Committee and the elected officials of the City of Red Deer.

Our fourth speaker was Mr. Robin Bovey, freelance environmental consultant and writer from Edmonton. Mr. Bovey outlined how the British countryside has now reached the point where the word, natural, no longer has any validity. The pressures on the remaining semi-natural areas are immense and, despite far-reaching protective legislation, unrelenting. In the light of this, the value of urban conservation is twofold. It provides habitat for many species, under increased pressure for survival, and brings urban populations closer to a more natural environment.

In the afternoon session, we went over a number of the topics that had been raised in the morning and we've outlined four major areas that were discussed.

First of all, the volunteers or volunteerism relating to these different projects was discussed. To initiate a project, approach existing service organizations, such as Elks, Lions and so on, and get the project started. Once volunteers are working, reward them with recognition, show them their importance with a volunteer recognition banquet or other perks, send them on seminars, courses and so on. Make them feel wanted. Make sure that the volunteers feel needed and that they are having fun at what they are doing. However, also make sure that there is strict control over volunteers and treat them as though they are paid personnel.

Educate school children with regard to these natural centres. For example, in Winnipeg and Red Deer, school programmes are very active in natural area education.

The second major area that was discussed was land acquisition. We discussed the philosophy of taking money in lieu of public reserve land. Taking land led to fragmentation in use, for example, in some areas. There are difficulties in defining reserve areas, and potential for abuse by taking money in lieu, so that it represents a tax, rather than providing land for recreational use. A partial solution offered was that municipalities could pool funds for the acquisition of land in one location. One large natural area in a municipality could be developed and the funds (given instead of land) could be used for the making of that one big park or one big area in a municipality.

Funding. Don't rely on government funding for all your funding needs. A speaker in our session indicated that if you became a registered charitable society you could then collect corporate funds and issue tax receipts. You should approach the corporate sector, private individuals and foundations for funding. It can be done without government funding. Natural areas can become self-sufficient.

The fourth area discussed was tourism and the impact on tourism. Natural areas are not restricted to serving the local population. They can serve as an important tourist attraction for the metropolitan region and local municipalities. It was mentioned that, in one area of Ontario, 70,000 birdwatchers came to one particular area over a 6 week period. So you can see that is a benefit to the entire area, economically.

Overall, in conclusion, our session was a learning experience. Natural areas are not merely an environmental conservation exercise, but also can become an important economic tool.

Thank you.

Moderator

Thanks Lee.

For the Regional Airport Authorities, the moderator was Councillor Albert Klapstein from the County of Leduc, and as presenter we have Ron Pollock, Councillor from the County of Parkland.

Councillor Ron Pollock, County of Parkland

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

This is delegation, Albert's style. He said, "Ron, just take a few notes." And then five minutes before this session started he said, "You'll have to get up there and present them too." So here I am.

Nonetheless, I think the Regional Airport study or concept has been around for a while and most of you should be aware of it. I hope you are and if you aren't, you'd better be, because it's coming. I'm convinced of that, as of today.

We had a very good presentation today and I found it to be one of the best on the subject that I've seen, and we've been at this for a little over a year now. We had, first of all, Mr. Austin Douglas and he is the Executive Director from the Airport Management Study Group from Transport Canada. He gave, and I have to commend him highly, a very good review of where we are at now, the process, the policy change that has come out, and the deregulation system that was initiated some time ago. As I said, he explained those various government processes very well and what the Federal Government is aiming to do with this policy.

We had, then, Mr. Peter Watson, from the Task Force Authority giving his perception of what's happened to date, where he thinks it's going and how involved we will be, or won't be, in the operation of the Authority. As most of you know, the Authority is conceived to be set up to take over the operation of all four airports in the region of the planning commission and the management of such an authority is still up in question. I think that, as he admitted, one of the more controversial points is going to be actually establishing that board and determining who is responsible to whom for what.

The next speaker we had was Ms. Carrie Schnelker, from Seattle, Washington representing the Seattle Port Authority. They look after the airports and the seaports in that area. I thought the system of government in Canada was complicated, with the Federal initiatives and controls that we have in our operation, but they've got something else going there. It certainly has an overtone of more local authority, but there seem to be a lot of ties

there, that bring about some very interesting situations in that airport authority.

We had a very interesting round of questions this afternoon and I will try to pick out some that may be of special interest.

What will the Authority be able to do that isn't being done now? That was one of the earlier questions and I think the general answer to that, by Mr. Watson, was that the Authority or locally operated authority could be a lot more responsive to the perceived needs of the community within the region. He suggested, and I don't think there was any disagreement, that Ottawa is usually subject to a lot of other priorities that they have to deal with when it comes to funding requests and expansion ideas. The Airport would also have the ability to initiate or allow to develop other kinds of revenue generating things that currently the Federal Government would not be as interested in getting involved in right now. However, on a regional basis these ideas might be a little more interesting to develop.

I think the Airport Authority would have to recognize that it's going to take some political and economic realities to operate. There were many questions, all of them quite interesting, but rather than get involved in that I'll just try to summarize what the outcome was.

I think it would be fair to say that if we are going to become involved in regional airports, in this country anyway, we're going to need some very interesting legislation to allow it to happen and interesting arrangements, at least on the local scene, on how it is going to be funded and actually brought into being. I think that's the key, at least as far as I see it now. Where we're at now is that we have to have some reasonable assurances on where this thing is going to end up and who is going to be responsible for it.

Again, just in closing, I think we're into this game. Mr. Douglas from Transport Canada suggested that if it doesn't go the way it's envisioned by the Regional Task Force group, as a private operation, it will probably go to some other lesser private form, but with very different management controls than what we're used to, right now in Canada. So, I think we might as well take a good hard look at this one and see if we can't make it fly. I think it definitely has some economic advantages for the region and I urge you all to become very familiar with it.

Thank you.

Closing Remarks



CLOSING REMARKS

Mr. R.G. Madziya, Executive Director
Edmonton Metropolitan Regional Planning Commission

Just in closing, I don't know whether I was the driver, or the referee, or whatever my role was today, but as the Chairman of today's events I would like to echo the comments that have been made by one of our moderators, Mr. Danchuk. However, before we do that and recognize the staff, I would like to thank you for attending. I know that today has been a long day. You have been provided with a massive amount of information which, I hope, was informative. Without your attendance this day would not be as successful as it has been. I think the success, sometimes, of a party is based on the number of people and their participation in that party. And certainly, for today's events, your participation, not only by coming, but in actually participating in the discussion, has meant a great deal to us. Of course to the speakers, those who have come from as far away as Kitchener, Waterloo, Ontario, Seattle, Vancouver, even as far as an hour and half drive from here in Red Deer, and of course from our own Edmonton, I am without words; all I can simply say is "thank you".

I would like to recognize those of the staff that are here. I know you have seen some of them, through registration and so forth, but for those that are here, if I might ask you to stand up so that at least you can be recognized.

I guess we've always prided ourselves on being able to provide more for less, by finetuning the processes and by the innovative thinking that goes into putting a seminar like this together. As I said this morning, we experimented last year. That was the first time ever for us holding this type of a seminar and we were not quite sure whether it was going to be an annual event or not. And, I think, because of the success that we had, based on your comments, your very positive and encouraging comments, we decided that we would do it again. And we are hoping that you will constructively, perhaps even destructively sometimes, criticize some of the issues or some of the areas that really need improvement. I'm a firm believer, as I'm sure all of us are, that there is always room for improvement. The day may have gone very well, and it is very difficult when you're directly involved in it to see whether or not it is actually going well, but it is through your constructive criticism, suggestions, recommendations that we can always strive to do better, as well as providing more for less. So, please, fill out those evaluation forms which are included with your registration material so that at least we can have some areas to look at as we start planning for the 1989 Seminar.

The Moderators - what can I say? When we were talking with them a couple of Mondays ago, we loaded them with a lot of information but there was nobody that we approached to moderate who said, no I can't, for whatever reason. And that

shows, to me anyway and the staff, the dedication, the commitment, the interest that our Commission members have. Unfortunately, we could only have 3, but there will be other seminars in the future for other members of the Commission to participate in. Thank you for taking such an active role in this seminar and thank you to our Commission Chairman.

Mayor Ross G. Quinn, Chairman
Edmonton Metropolitan Regional Planning Commission

It has been a long day and I don't want to keep you any longer. What we tried to do today was to bring up some of the regional issues and have you talk about them and give some thought as to how we, the Commission, or municipal and provincial representatives, can best deal with them. As Chairman of the Commission over the past few years I have found myself, on many occasions, dealing with the same two conflicting questions. No matter what the issue, there is always one group of people asking why the Commission isn't involved, and another group telling me, that the Commission shouldn't be involved. It is because of these two questions that I think these seminars are so important. I think it is important to be able to talk about these issues and, if necessary, put forward solutions which might in fact be different from the way we usually do things. I think, when dealing with question "Where Do We Fit In?", we must realize that one size does not fit all; that we should strive for the best solution, not necessarily the easiest one to carry out. We must ensure that the Regional Planning Commission has enough flexibility in its mandate to meet the needs of the Region it serves.

Now, clearly, I am not saying that the Regional Planning Commission is the only appropriate body to deal with all the issues which are regional in scope. Some issues, as we have seen today, are better looked after at other levels. However, when appropriate, we should not be afraid to utilize the great potential that exists throughout the Commission to deal with these inter-municipal issues.

I, too, would like to thank our staff. Good Job. Well done. I would also like to thank the Commission members, the panelists, for all their assistance in this seminar. It couldn't have been done without you. And last, but not least, I would like to thank you, the participants for coming and sharing with us today. I sincerely hope that you've learned something that will be of assistance to you, that you will be able to take home to your local municipalities, your local commissions, and that will benefit you on a daily basis.

Thank you very much.